

STACK
ANNEX

5

095

767

A

0
0
0
5
7
3
0
7
1



JC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



WITH THE COMMENTARY
OF THE AUTHOR.

THE K TEXT OF JOSHUA

MAX L. MARGOLIS

1866 1932

Reprinted for private circulation from
THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, October 1911

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXVIII

OCTOBER, 1911

NUMBER 1

THE K TEXT OF JOSHUA

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS
Dropsie College

1. With the letter K is designated Codex Tischendorfianus II of the Leipzig University Library which the famous discoverer of the Sinaiticus brought home from his first oriental trip in 1844. It consists of 22 palimpsest leaves of which 17 contain in uncial script under an Arabic text biblical fragments from Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges. Not only were some of the leaves in a bad condition, but the margins of most of them had been cut off or otherwise mutilated in the process of their employment as bindings for other codices. The fragments which Tischendorf assigned to the seventh century at the latest were published by him in the first volume of his *Monumenta sacra inedita, nova collectio*, 1855; the leaves containing all that is left of the Book of Joshua are found on pp. 161-70.

2. On the text of codex K Tischendorf expresses himself as follows (p. xxxiii of his Introduction): "Ipse vero textus horum fragmentorum admodum peculiaris et gravis est, a Vaticano quidem textu satis diversus neque magis vero simillimus Alexandrino. Inprimis discedit a Vaticana editione pariter atque ab Alexandrino

codice per libros Iosuae et Iudicum, ubi prae ceteris assentientes habet Holmesii codices 75. 54. 118. 44. 59. 74. 76. 84. 106. 134." He then gives a few instances. For *εκμωθα* 165a, 10, he adduces *εκμαθα* 75 as the nearest reading. He overlooked *εκμωθα* 54 in Parsons. As for *μωσαν* 162a, 8, which he mentions as a singular reading, *μωσαν* 118 comes pretty close, not to mention *βωσαν* 75 *βωωσαν* 54 which, considering the well-known graphic similarity of β and μ in the cursive script, are not so remote either.

3. As I am preparing for publication an edition of the Greek Joshua according to the text of the cursives with which Tischendorf's uncial stands in affinity, I shall reserve for the preface to that edition an account of the attention which these manuscripts have thus far received, of the discovery that they constitute a group, and of the conjectures concerning the recension which they represent. I shall here single out only the latest contribution by Ernst Hautsch (*Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch*, Berlin, 1910) who recognizes in the group, particularly in the smaller sub-group (54. 75), none other than the Lucianic recension. But whether Lucian's or not, it is certainly a recension, and it is just as manifest that it is not Origen's.

4. So far as the Book of Joshua goes, 59 steps out as a member of the group in question. This is at least my impression from the readings given by Parsons. The case is different in the Book of Judges (see Moore's *Commentary*, Introduction). On the other hand, Cod. Gr. 609 of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris must be included: I find it to be almost a twin-brother of 44; but 106 with which they are both related excels them.

5. A still further witness of the text underlying our group may be found in the Old Latin of the Codex Lugdunensis. According to the editor, Ulysse Robert (*Heptateuchi partis posterioris versio latina antiquissima*, Lyon, 1900), its nearest relatives are 74, 54, 106, 134. My own examination, however, goes to reveal a closer affinity with 54. 75. 118. To mention but one example, the peculiar reading *εκμωθα* adverted to by Tischendorf (see § 2) recurs in the Latin in the form *ecmoth* which, by the way, is the more correct, the final *a* being an error of dittography. There are also noteworthy deviations. Thus it occasionally reverts in a pronounced

manner to the B type so far as its groundwork is concerned, and some readings it shares with the Sahidic version (cf., e.g., 15: 27 *asergarri* with *ασεργαρε*). The points of contact with 54. 75. 118 are, however, sufficient to warrant a collation.

6. In presenting on this occasion an edition of K ahead of my forthcoming edition of the entire text (see § 3) I am guided by the desire to take my bearings for the latter. The collation which accompanies the edition of the fragments makes it clear that of the group of cursives signalized by Tischendorf it is the smaller group (54. 75. 118) with which the affinity of K is most marked and among the three it is 54 that must be singled out in particular. For 118 stands somewhat aside, and 75 is a curtailed text, its omissions being not always due to errors, but obviously to a desire for condensation. To be sure, 54 errs on the side of amplification through the admission of matter which we may conjecture stood on the margin of the archetype. Just how far 54 may be followed is revealed by a comparison with K. It is furthermore clear that the recensional character of K. 54 is obliterated in the larger group (74. 76. etc.) into which matter from the cognate, yet distinct recension by Origen has been admitted. I feel therefore that I shall be justified in my future edition to make 54 the basis of my text, while the variants from the other witnesses may be conveniently placed below in the apparatus.

7. I have supplied in brackets the lacunae of K which Tischendorf, barring exceptions (165b, 1; 169b, 3, 4, 5 in part, 6-10; 170a, 10, 23), has refrained from doing. As the reader will see, there is room for grave doubt only in the fewest instances. Below the text I give in three sets of Notes the variants from (1) 54. 75. 118. Old Latin, (2) 84. 134. 76. 74. 106. Cod. Gr. Paris. 609. 44, (3) BAΘG. 55. Lagarde's Greek text (the so-called Lucian), the Syrohexaplaris in Lagarde's edition, Dillmann's Ethiopic (codices FH), and Ciasca's Sahidic. For the uncials I have used the phototypic editions, while for the cursives I possess photographs which the authorities of Dropsie College have kindly secured for my use. My information is thus based on first-hand sources throughout. I say this, because I have discovered numerous inaccuracies in Swete's edition. Maes and Drusius I quote from the *Critici Sacri*; occasionally there

will be found readings from Swete's and Parsons' apparatus, also references to Field and Eusebius (*Onomastica*, ed. Klostermann). While in the first set of my Notes I have recorded all divergences even of an orthographic character, the variants in the other two sets have in the main been confined to matters that count. A textual commentary accompanies the edition.

8. I use the following sigla: KBAG which require no explanation; Θ is the Washington manuscript edited by Sanders; r=54; o=75; s=118; R=ros; ℒ=Old Latin; u=84; l=134; p=76; t=74; v=ulpt; f=106; i=Cod. Gr. 609; z=44; F=fiz; Λ=Lagarde; S=Syrohexaplaris; ℄th=Ethiopic (codices FH) (℄^{eg}=Ethiopic, codices CG, occasionally referred to); ℄=Sahidic. *=prima manus; ¹=correction by the first or a contemporaneous hand; ²=correction by a later hand; t=textus; m(after a codex)=margo. For the hands of BA I use Swete's sigla as well as his information. Further sigla and abbreviations: ℋ^s=the Hebrew text underlying the Greek version (Septuagint); ℋ^o=the Hebrew text read by Origen; ℋ^m=the masoretic text. G=the original of the Septuagint; α'σ'θ'=Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion; o'=the Septuagint column of the Hexapla; ast=asteriscus. In the Textual Commentary <=from and >=leads to. Helbing=*Grammatik der Septuaginta* von Dr. Robert Helbing, Göttingen, 1907.

9. Postscript. Thompson's *Coptic Palimpsest*, Oxford, 1911, reached me after the article had been set in type. As almost the whole book of Joshua is contained in that publication, I have collated Ciasca's fragment with Thompson's text and the remainder of the latter as far as it covers the Greek text here published with the apparatus in the third series of variants. I append here the results of my collation (℄^c=Ciasca's text, ℄^t and from 162a, 12 ℄=Thompson's text), leaving for the future a fuller discussion of them:

161a 1-3 drop ^{vid} after ℄ | 17 -ας ℄^t error, the scribe had in mind p. 53b, l. 31 | 22/23 γοσομ ℄^t || 161b 1 read τουτους ℄^tAGS] αυτων Bh℄ : > ℄^c | και=℄^c] κατα ℄^t=AΘ | 7 αβις ℄, initial ι dropped out by haplography in the Coptic text | 10 μρρων ℄^t, see editor's note | 13 ζιφ ℄^t | 18 ραββα ℄^t | 23 φενανδωρ ℄^t || 162a 2-4 ενιους. φερεξαιους, ιεβουσαιους ℄^t | 6/7 τους υπο

[την ερημον]>C^T | 12 λαος πολυς cf. C, prob. inner-Coptic addition || 162b 6
 εγω is expressed in C^T || 163a 1 εος post κατεδιωκον, prob. inner-Coptic addition
 | 4/5 μασερων BhC | μαρσεμωμαν C=μασερεβω μαν=μασερεφωθ μαιν | 7 λον C
 (but initial and final letter doubtful) corrupt | 15 ειπεν C | 16 τους| prm και
 C | 10/11 στοματι ξιφους C | 21 βασιλειωv C || 164a 3/4 sg. C | 5/6 συνεταξεν|
 + ει CC | 16 ις C | 23/25 και απωλεια (= αναρων?) απωλεσεν αυτους (+ νσα
 νευερην) εν στοματι ξιφους; the order, of course, may have been changed by
 the translator || 164b 7 ωσαντως>C, prob. as in C accommodation to the
 translator's idiom | 9/10 και-εποιησεν|>C, inner-Coptic omission through
 homoioteuton | 18 ναγεβ C || 165a 1 αραβα| prm art C | 16 βασαν C | 23
 ασεχα C || 165b 2 γεργεσι C | 5 γαλααδ| οριον γαλαατ C | 6 οριον C || 166a
 7 χλκα C | 10 αυτην C (paraphrased by terram) | 14 εν| prm et C | 16 αραβα|
 prm art C | 19/20 εν αγεβ C || 166b 3/4 και τον γεργεσαιον C | 18 δααβιρ C |
 20 γαισει C=γεσει cf. C, hence pointing to γεσειρ | 22 αραθ C=C | 23 λεβινα
 C | + βασιλεια οδολαμ C (the sum total is XXIX) | 24 μακηδα C || 167a
 2 φυλης| + υιων C | 3 μωνσς| + κληρονομαιαν C | 4 τη| + γη C | 5 ημωσειν|
 ημωσει φυλης μανωσση C | 6 ις| + κληρονομαιαν C | 8/9 εν τω περαν του ιωρδανου|
 >C || 167b 3 πασαν C | 5 αυτων C | 16 την| γην C || 168a 22 του| terrae C ||
 168b 16 ιερεως C ? | C missing from αρχων—οργη, 168b 20—170b 1, but
 through change of order the wds. πασαν την [συνα]γωγην ιηλ are extant at the
 end || 170b 2 αυτος| αχαρ C | 3 μη μονος C | 14—16 ο θς θ' εστιν και αυτος εστιν
 κς ο θς και ο θς αυτος ουδεν C

I wish also to add *ad* § 5 end an example of a singular coincidence between **A** and **C** which both share with s, the three standing alone with their peculiar text. I refer to 5, 3 where s**C****A** add after *iηλ* the sentence *και εθηκεν θιμωνιας ακροβυστιων* (prefaced in s**C** by the phrase *εκ δευτερου*, also found in iz, but repeated from vs. 2), with which cf. Pirke derabbi Eliezer, c. 29 (קבץ כל הערות עד ששה) (אותם כנבעה), Cant. r., s. 4 (on 4, 6) (העמיד להם ערלותיהם גבעה) = Eccl. r., s. 11 (on 11, 2) (ששאו אותה גבעה בערלות), cf. also Gen. r., s. 47 (on 17, 23) with reference to Abraham (העמידן גבעה), and contrast Levit. r., s. 25 (on 19, 23) (ערלות נקים שהיא גבעה), cf. the commentary (בתמות כהונה ידי משה against בערלה). — *Ad* § 7: p (=76) is a palimpsest certain leaves of which are wholly or partly undecipherable, at least in the photograph; thus the evidence from p is lacking for the bulk of the third fragment here published (22:7 ff.).

K 161a

[καθαπερ εποιησά]

39 X

τη λομνα· και τω

βασιλει αυτης:—

⁴⁰ Και επαταξεν ις̄

40

5 πασαν την ορινη̄

RL

161a 1-3]>o | 1 καθαπερ] prm και rs quod non dubito quin K habuerit in ultima linea folii praecedentis: sic \mathfrak{L} et sicut ante fecit dabit transponenda sunt, ergo και > \mathfrak{L} | εποιησαν Krs] εποιησεν \mathfrak{L} | 2 λομνα K] λοβνα rs: λεμνα \mathfrak{L} | 4 ¶ Kr | 5 ορινην Kr] ορηνην ο* (ορινην ο¹): γην την ορεινην \mathfrak{L} : γην της ορεινης s | 6/7 και την πεδινην και τον νοτον [[νοτον Kr] νωτον ο]] Kro] και την

UF

161a vs. 39b] >iz | 1 καθαπερ sine και uf | 2 λομνα] λοβνα uf | 4 ¶ ul | 5 ορινη̄] γην της ορεινης UF | 6/7 και ναγεβ και την πεδινην και τον νοτον και

BCEhAΘAGS

161a 1-3 hAΘAGS (absque signis) >BCE^{vid} (C incipit a τω βασιλει αυτης) | 1 καθαπερ AΘAGS] prm και h | εποιησαν AΘG(ν superscr.)S] εποιησε Λ | 2 τη λομνα] την λομναν h: τη λεβνα ΘAGS: τη λεβμνα A | 4 ¶ h AΘG | 5 πασαν BhAΘ] prm την G (sub ✕) ΛS(⤴) | την BhAΘ] >Λ | ορινη̄]

Textual
Commentary

161a 1-3 The omission in o is most probably due to homoioteleuton (the preceding clause ends in και τω βασιλει αυτης). Where namely s \mathfrak{L} coincide with r in including a clause or word wanting in B, it is improbable to assume that o has reverted to B. Whether the omission in B is likewise due to error, it is difficult to tell. The error may just as well have occurred in \mathfrak{H}^s . On the other hand it must be owned that the clause rather lags in \mathfrak{H}^m . Or the omission in o (and perhaps also in B) is due to a desire for condensation; iz go still further by omitting vs. 39b entire || και καθαπερ rsh = וְכַתְּבָהּ \mathfrak{H}^m || εποιησε Λ \mathfrak{L} = וַיַּעַשׂ \mathfrak{H}^m . The others assimilate the number to that of the verbs in vs. a || 2 λομνα Kh < λοβνα rsuf possibly = וַיַּבְנֶה (comp. וַיִּבְנֶה); or o is an error for ε (in uncial script); λεμνα \mathfrak{L} < λεβνα ΘAGS (A has both β and μ: λεβμνα) = וַיִּבְנֶה \mathfrak{H}^m , ε = — in unaccented closed syllable. h construes ποιειν with the accusative (see also 163a, l. 14-15), hence την λομναν (-ν Greek accusative ending), but leaves τω βασιλει || 4-6 If the Greek translators understood their Hebrew as well as the author of the masoretic accentuation (comp. EV.), they wrote: και επαταξεν ις̄ πασαν την γην· την ορεινην και την ναγεβ (or και τον νοτον, comp. EV. and the South) και την πεδινην και την ασηδωθ. In consequence of bad exegesis, the upper point was deleted; the result was πασαν την γην την ορεινην (terram montuosam \mathfrak{L}) and still further by a change of construction πασαν την γην της ορεινης (all except Kro). Λ alone with its insertion of εν στοματι ξιφους

K 161a

και την πεδινη
και τον νοτον· και
την ασηδωθ' και
τους βασιλεις αυ-
των· και ου κατε-

X

ναγεβ και την πεδινην [[ναγεβs] nazeḅ 𐤀]s 𐤀 | 8 ασηδωθ Krs 𐤀] ασιδωθ ο | 9/10

[[τον]>z]] UF | 10/11 κατελ(ε)ιπον fi | κατελιπεν uz | 14 ζων]+εξ αυτων UF |

γην της ορ(ε)νης B rel: γην εν στοματι ξιφους την ορεινην Λ | 6/7 και την πεδινη και τον νοτον] και την ναβαι και την πεδεινην B^C: και την ναγεβ και την πεδινην hAΘAGS̄ (S^m a' σ' και τον νοτον): και τον λιβα και την πεδινην C | 8 ασηδωθ BhCAΘG] ασηδαθ C: ασιδωθ Λ: 𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 S̄ | τους BhC^CEAΘ]+παντας Λ et sub ※: GS̄ | 9/10 αυτων h (S^m a' σ' αυτων)] αυτης B^CEAΘAGS̄ | 10 και]

(from vs. 39?) between γην and την ορεινην shows an insight into the correct meaning of the Hebrew. It is possible, however, that the bad exegesis is to be charged to the account of S; the text then underlying Kro which is preserved in its integrity in 𐤀 implies a correction based perhaps on the version from which νοτος was derived. In the immediate ancestor of Kro namely γην την had dropped out, either by homoioteleuton, or because γην was miswritten την which naturally entrained the loss of την. Hebrew 𐤏𐤍 was, of course, left untranslated by either version; Origen supplied, presumably from Aquila, την sub ast; what resulted was unreadable Greek: την πασαν την γην, hence the correction in Λ: την πασαν γην || The Hebrew order 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 is preserved everywhere except in Kro. Was και τον νοτον an afterthought, i.e. an insertion from the margin which was put in the wrong place? Comp. UF with their doublet. Doublets are said to be characteristic of Lucian || 𐤏𐤍 was transliterated by S as ναγεβ which was corrupted in B^C into ναβαι. The stages are as follows: ναγεβ και > ναβεγ (so 71) και > ναβεκ και > ναβε και > ναβαι και. και has caused the omission of a final κ in a preceding place name quite frequently; just as on the other hand εν led to the dropping out of the initial ν of a name following || According to S^m, a' σ' rendered 𐤏𐤍 by νοτος, hence the νοτος in UF by the side of ναγεβ and in Kro in the place thereof || C apparently found λψ for 𐤏𐤍 || nazeḅ 𐤀 is a corruption from nageb || 6 ασηδωθ] written in some copies ασηδωδ (spirantie pronunciation of θ and δ); hence the confusion with 𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 in S; the reverse occurs likewise || Is ασηδαθ C due to την? The tendency to change the plural into a singular may be witnessed elsewhere; comp. γαλιλαθ 168a, 21/22. Other examples are available || 9 𐤏𐤍 in front of 𐤏𐤍 which was wanting in the κοινή was supplied by Origen || 9/10

K 161a

λείπον ἐξ αὐτῶ

X

διασεσωσμενον·

καὶ παν ἐμπνεον

καὶ ζων ἐξωλο-

15 θρευσεν καὶ ἀνε-
θεματισεν· ὃν τρο-
πον ἐνετείλατο

ἧς ὁ θς ἰηλ' : ⁴¹ καὶ ἐ-

41

αὐτῶν Kro \mathfrak{L}] αὐτῆς s | 10/11 κατελ(ε)ιπον Ks \mathfrak{L}] κατελειπεν ro | 13 ἐμπνεον K]
ἐμπνέον R | 14 καὶ ζων KR] ζῶης (*vitam*; sequitur *et*) \mathfrak{L} ? | 14/15 ἐξωλοθρευσεν K]
ἐξολοθρευσεν ro: ἐξωλοθρευσε s: ἐξωλοθρευσαν \mathfrak{L} | 15/16 καὶ ἀνεθεματισεν KR]
> \mathfrak{L} | ἀνεθεματισεν Krs] ἀναθεματισεν o | 18 ¶ K]>r | 18/19 καὶ ἐπαταξεν ἰς

18. ¶ l | 18/19 καὶ ἐπαταξεν ἰς] καὶ ἀπεκτείνειν αὐτοὺς ἰς uf: συναπεκτείνειν αὐτοὺς

>omn | 10/11 κατελ(ε)ιπον BhAG] κατελειπαν A : κατελιμπαν © | 11 ἐξ αὐτῶ
h] αὐτῶν BCC: ἐν αὐτῇ AΘΔGΣ (G ἐν — αὐτῇ, sed ponendus est obelus ante
ἐν ut in Σ) | 12 διασεσωσμενον AΘ] σεσωσμενον BhAG | 14 καὶ ζων] ζῶης BCCΔ
et sub — GΣ : ἐξ αὐτῆς AΘ : >h | 14/15 ἐξωλῶθρευσεν B©] ἐξωλῶθρευσαν
hCAΘΔGΣ | 15/16 καὶ ἀνεθεματισεν]>omn | 18 ἰηλ Brell]>© | ¶ AΘ | 18/19

αὐτῶν Kro \mathfrak{L} ufh=הַם(בִּלְכִּי)=a' σ' according to Σ^m; © wrote αὐτῆς=
הַם(בִּלְכִּי). The translator saw the antecedent of the pronoun in the last
place name תַּרְדֵּינָה, תִּהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר; or, if we are charitable enough, in תַּרְדֵּינָה
|| 10 καὶ Kr \mathfrak{L} uf, an innocent addition, not warranted by \mathfrak{H}^m || 10/11 κατελι-
πον (or the vulgar form κατελιπαν A; its consort © inserts a parasitic μ in
front of the π, see Helbing, 22). The singular (rouzh)= \mathfrak{H}^m (subject
Joshua) || 11 αὐτῶν or ἐξ αὐτῶν or ἐν αὐτῇ not in \mathfrak{H}^m . The former (αὐτῶν or
ἐξ αὐτῶν) would correspond to הָם (comp. 8:22), the latter to בָּהּ (comp.
10:30). Probably additions due to reminiscence of the parallel passages ||
12 διασεσωσμενον or the simplex σεσωσμενον, an inner-Greek variant || 13/14
In order to differentiate רָאָה כָּל הַנֶּשְׁמָה from רָאָה כָּל הַנֶּשֶׁם © may
have written παν ἐμπνεον ζῶης, although 11:11 where there was more cause
for differentiation both נֶשֶׁם and נֶשְׁמָה are rendered indiscriminately
ἐμπνεον. Origen naturally obelized ζῶης. His Greek text was therefore
akin to B. Kr have παν ἐμπνεον καὶ ζων; perhaps a doublet, i.e. some
translator rendered נֶשְׁמָה by ζων (comp. Deut. 20:16 *omne vitum* August.
for *omnem spirantem* \mathfrak{L}). hAΘ have simply παν ἐμπνεον; AΘ, however,
introduce ἐξ αὐτῆς, comp. ἐξ αὐτῶν uf (on the top of καὶ ζων); the phrase
was added in some copies on the basis of parallel passages || 14/15 The

K 161a

Παταξεν ἰς ἀπο κα-

X

20 δης βαρην· και ε-
 ως γαζης· και πα-
 σαν την γην γο-
 ζον· εως γης γα-
 βαων· ⁴²παντας

42

25 °τους βασιλεις του-

KR]>ℒ | επαταξεν KRo|+αυτους s | 20 και KR]>ℒ | 22/23 γοζον K] γοζομ r:
 γομοζ o: γοσομ s: γασομ ℒ | 23 γης K] της ro ℒ : prms της s | 24 παντας KRo]
 prms και s ℒ

iz | 22/23 γοζον] γοσομ UF | 23 γης] της Uñ : prms της z | 24 παντας] prms
 και UF | 25 —

και επαταξεν ἰς] και απεκτεινεν αυτους ἰς AΘAGS (absque signis): >Bh^{CE}th |
 20 και>omn | 21 και] και την A et sub ※ G (S και tantum sub ※ habet):
 >Bh^{CE}AΘ | 22 την γην CΑΘ] γην AGS: την Bh^C | 22/23 γοζον] γοσον CG
 cf. S: γοσομ Bh^CAΘA | 23 γης Θ] της B rel | 24 πάντας] πασας A (sic): prms
 και omn | 25 —

sing. and plur. as in the case of הַשָּׂרִיר; but note how inconsistent the codices are || 15/16 και αναθεματισεν KRUF a doublet. αναθεματιζειν for הַרְחִיק is more literal than εξολεθρευειν. Comp. EV. utterly destroyed with the margin: Heb. devoted || αναθεματισεν o without the augment which all the others have || 18 ἡλ omitted only in C || 18/19 The Hebrew יִכָּהֵן יְהוֹשֻׁעַ is resumptive of יִכָּהֵן יְהוֹשֻׁעַ at the head of vs. 40. A translator like S might condense the text if he chose. The clause is accordingly omitted in Bh^{CE}thℒ. It was then restored by the recensions. Origen wrote και απεκτεινεν αυτους ἰς. Observe that the ast is wanting in GS. Is that the reason why the clause is retained in AΘ? Origen's wording penetrated also into UF (iz omit και and write συναπεκτεινεν, so as to indicate that the verb is resumptive and that the clause is in the nature of a summary). In the recension underlying Kr the clause is rendered και επαταξεν ἰς; apparently from another source. Observe the difference in the verb and the retention or omission of the object. An exegetical difference and perhaps even a textual variation underlie the two renderings. Origen read יִכָּהֵן with ℳ and took the suffix to refer to the kings mentioned in vs. 40. Accordingly he employs the verb αποκτεινεν. The other recension possibly read יִכָּהֵן and took as its object the afore-mentioned localities; hence πατασσειν || 20 The idiomatic י in יִכָּהֵן is expressed in Kr, but left untranslated in the remainder of the witnesses. In this instance the

K 161b

τους και [την γην]

X

αυτων [ελαβεν]

iṣ̄ εις απαξ [ο γαρ]

kṣ̄ ο θῖ συν[επολε-

5 μει τω iḥ[λ: ¹εγε-

1 XI

161b 4 ο Kro]>s | θῖ Ko] + iḥλ rs¹ | 4/5 συνεπολεμη ο | 5/7 εγενετο

161b 1 τουτους] αυτων uf : >z | 3 ο γαρ]οτι uf | 4 ο θῖ ulf]>pt | θῖ]+

161b 1 τουτους AGS] αυτων Bh^{CE} | τουτους και] αυτου (·) τους κατα A^Θ | 2 ελαβεν CA^ΘAGS] επαταξεν Bh^{Cth} | 3 ο γαρ] οτι BhA^ΘAGS | 4 ο θῖ h^C] + iḥλ B^ΘAGS: >CA | 5 iḥλ Bh^{CEth}A^Θ] + ⁴³και ανεστρεψεν iṣ̄ εις γαλγαλα Λ:

recension represented by KR goes further than Origen in imitating the Hebrew. But the γ in $\gamma\eta$ is left out even in KR || 21 και expressing the γ of \mathfrak{H}^m both in the recension underlying KR¹ and in Origen. The latter also inserted $\tau\eta\eta$ to express $\tau\eta$, both words being prefixed by an ast. In this instance (contrast above on ll. 4-6) the second $\tau\eta\eta$ is wanting not only in A, but also in G. The introduction of και is in this case not a matter of idiom, but of text and exegesis. If we omit the conjunction, the land of Goshen as far as Gibeon is tantamount to the territory between Kadesh and Gaza. See Gemoll, *Grundsteine zur Geschichte Israels*, 1911, 35 f. || 22 $\tau\eta\eta$ γην was apparently written by S (comp. C); γην dropped out subsequently through error (hence B and its consorts) || 22/23 The name $\gamma\eta$ became in Greek transliteration γοσον (so C and, of course, Origen); the corruptions noted above all admit of easy explanation || 23 Here $\tau\eta\varsigma$ (against $\gamma\eta\varsigma$ K^Θ; s has both: $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\gamma\eta\varsigma$) undoubtedly represents the original || 24 The γ of \mathfrak{H}^m is expressed by all except Kro. It is the γ of summing up and might, of course, be missed even in Hebrew || 25 —

161b 1 τουτους= $\tau\eta\eta$ \mathfrak{H}^m was written both by Origen and by the parallel recension (KR¹); S wrote αυτων (B and its consorts), \mathfrak{H}^s apparently read $\tau\eta\eta$ for $\tau\eta$. The $\kappa\omicron\iota\upsilon\eta$ reading found its way into UF (the omission in z is due to condensation) || A^Θ unite in presenting a worthless reading: αυτου τους=αυ τουτους=αυ[των] τουτους, a sort of a doublet; κατα is a corruption from και τ[ην] || ελαβεν= $\tau\eta$ \mathfrak{H}^m which reading penetrated also into C is common to both recensions; S wrote επαταξεν= $\tau\eta$, comp. vs. 40 || 3 ο γαρ KR¹ against οτι in the remainder; a striving after less slavish Greek || 4 The omission of iḥλ in Ko and elsewhere is in all probability due to condensation in view of the presence of the word at the end of the verse. With iḥλ, also ο θῖ disappeared in CA. Much liberty was taken, it appears, with the divine names || 5 The converse

K 161b

Νετο δε ως [ηκου-]
 σεν ιαβιμ [βασι-]
 λεις ασω[ρ απεσ-]
 τιλεν προ[ς ιωβαβ]
 10 βασιλεα μα[ρων]

XI

δε ως ηκουσεν KR | ως δε ηκουσεν 𐤅 | 7 ιαβιμ K | ιαβειν R: *abir* 𐤅 | 8/9 απεστι-
 λεν K | απεστειλεν O: απεστειλε RS | 9 ιωβαβ R | *iroban* 𐤅 | 10/13 μαρων—
 βασιλεα >S | 10 μαρων KRo | *amarrown* 𐤅 | 12 σομορων KRo | *σομορρων* 𐤅 |

ἰήλ UF | 5 τω ἰήλ UF | αυτοις iz | 7 ιαβιμ | ἰιβιν UF | 10 μα[ρων] | μαδων UF |

+⁴³✕ και ανεστρεψεν ἰς και πας ἰήλ μετ αυτου εις πολεμον εις την παρεμβολην εις
 γαλγαλα : [[εις πολεμον]>S] G⁵ | 5/7 εγενετο δε ως | ως δε omn | 7 ιαβιμ |
 ιαβειν h¹ΘΔG⁵: ιαβεις Bh*¹EA: αβις C | 7/8 ιαβ. βασι[λεως] | βασιλεως ιαβ.
 h | 9 ιωβαβ B rel | ιωαβ Λ: ιωραμ h | 10 μα[ρων] | μαρρων B: μαρρον C: αμαρ-

process of condensation may be witnessed in iz which replaces τω ἰήλ by αυτοις || Verse 43 exists only in Origen's recension (G⁵; in an abbreviated form in Λ). εις πολεμον G which C rightly omits is merely a scribal error. The same verse is found repeated in 𐤅^m in this very chapter, vs. 15 (the preceding vs. 14 likewise ends in נִלְחָם לִי־וְרָגַל). As the verse there is found in ro (alongside with the codices representing Origen's recension; Lagarde prints against his own manuscript on the authority of Maes an obelus, but G has an ast; the verse is also extant in B^{b¹c¹mg¹}Cth), it may be concluded that K likewise had it. In front of 𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤀, as Lagarde informs us, there may be seen in his Syriac manuscript an erasure covering a word of, as it seems, four letters; perhaps it was 𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤀=εις πολεμον G in vs. 43 || 5/7 C, of course, read וְיָהִי כַשְׁבִּיז with 𐤅^m which he rendered somewhat freely ως δε ηκουσεν; KRUF (but not 𐤅, nor Origen) express וְיָהִי || 7 The ιαβ(ε)ιν of the two recensions (in K μ is a miswritten ν) is, of course, the result of reverting to 𐤅^m; nevertheless, we may be reasonably certain that C wrote ιαβιν likewise and that ιαβεις in the B texts (also in A) is due to assimilation with ιαβης 𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤀; hence perhaps the transposition in h: βασιλεως ιαβεις ασωρ. In proper names, assimilation of one name to another led to error || 9 ιωβαβ which escaped disfigurement in the B texts became ιωαβ in Λ through assimilation to Joab, and ιωραμ in h through assimilation to J(eh)oram (graphic similarity of P and B, and of β and μ); a sort of conflate of ιωβαβ and ιωραμ is *iroban*=ιρωβαμ || 10 𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤀 𐤅^m is found in Origen, whence it penetrated into UF, whereas KR⁵ kept the κοινή reading. The latter in the form μαρων (in μαρρων the gemination is inner-Greek; αμαρρων with a dittographed after βασιλεα) is what C wrote, and goes back

K 161b

και προς β[ασιλεια]
 σομορων [και προς]
 βασιλεια αζ[ιφ² και
 προς τους [βασιλεις]
 15 τους κατ[α σιδω-]
 να την μ[εγαλην]
 εις την ο[ρηνην]

XI

2

13 α[ζιφ] K | αζηφ s: αξιμ ℒ : ζιφ ro | 17 ορηνην ro | ορεινην s | 18 την K | prn

13 αζ[ιφ] | ιαζιφ(ιαζηφ z)UF | 14 τους>p | 18 την | prn εις | 21 -ερωθ i |

(ρ)ων ℄: μαδων AΘAGS | 12 σομορων] σομερων AΘAG (סֹמֶרֹן): συμωων Bh℄: samō'ān ℄th | 13 αζ[ιφ] | αξιφ Bh℄: σιφ ℄: αχιφ AΘ: ασχαφ GΣ: χασαφ Δ | 18 την] prn εις omn | α[ραβα] h℄AGΣ: ραβα B℄th: ραβαθ A: ραβαθα Θ | 18-20 και προς τους απο βορρα cf. Σ^m α' σ' και προς τους βασιλεις

to בִּרְיוֹן = בִּרְאוֹן 12:20 where it is combined with שְׂמִירָן || 12 The readings of the two recensions, σομορων and σομερων, unless corrupted from σεμερων, presuppose שְׂמִירָן in the place of שְׂמִירָן. The B texts have συμωων, comp. 12:20. If the reading be correct (it is quite possible that it is corrupted from συμρων or συμωων), the translator read שְׂמִירָן (ש and ר were similar in a transitional alphabet after ש had been opened at the top) || 13 αχσαφ of Origen (χασαφ Δ is faulty) = אַחְסַאִי ℔^m; but αχσαφ, I believe, was also written by Θ. Owing to the similarity of pronunciation between φ and spirantic β (comp. above a remark on θ and δ), αχσαφ was miswritten αχσαβ and then by assimilation to the name אַחְסַאִי = αχσιβ, αξιβ (which underlies αξιμ ℒ), αξιφ, αζιφ (ξ miswritten as ζ). Through haplography after βασιλεια, the initial α dropped out, the scribe having in mind ζιφ, זִיִּי. αχιφ AΘ is a cross between αχσαφ and αζιφ || 15/16 In ℔^s, בְּרִיּוֹן רַבְּהִבְהָרַי ℔^m appeared as בְּרִיּוֹן רַבְּהִבְהָרַי; the current Greek text was retained by both recensions || 18 εις which is omitted by K alone should be restored || The dropping of the initial α in αραβα (B℄th) is not original, but proceeded from the mistaken interpretation of the α as the Hebrew article (א) which indeed would be redundant after the Greek article. ραβα made certain scribes think of Rabbah (in Ammon); hence ραβαθ A ραβαθα (with dittographed α; απεναντι follows) Θ || 18/20 και προς τους απο βορρα K℔thUF is derived, as we may gather from Σ^m (where read with Field אֶחָד), from α' σ' and represents, in agreement with ℔^m, the parallel to τους κατα σιδωνα την μεγαλην Θ. Note again that the second element of the

K 161b

XI

και την α[ραβα και]
 προς του[ς απο βορ-]
 20 ρα· απεν[αντι χε-]
 νερεθ· κ[αι εν τη]
 πεδινη· κ[αι εις]
 φενναεδ[ωρ· και]

εις R 11 | 20/21 χενερεθ Ks 11 | χεννερεθ r: χενναρεθ o | 22/23 και εις φενναεδ[ωρ]
 K] και εις φενναεθδωρ (*et in faenaneldor*) 11: σεφενα ενδωρ o: σεφεσνα ενδωρ r:

22 και]prn και εις σεφενα (σεφενα fz) | 23 φενναεδ[ωρ]] φενναενδωρ i :

τους κατα βορραν (l. כַּנְרִית; כַּנְרִית; cf. כַּנְרִית) >omn | 20/21 [χε]νερεθ
 hΘAGS (כַּנְרִית): χενερεθθι A: κενερωθ BΘ | 21/22 [εν τη] πεδινη] εις το πεδιον
 [[εις]>A]] omn | 23 φενναεδ[ωρ]] φενναεδδωρ B: פִּנְנָדָר C: φαναντωρ C:

doublet comes in at a posterior place || 20 απεναντι = כַּנְרִית 11^m for כַּנְרִית 11^m;
 left uncorrected by both recensions || 20/21 כַּנְרִית for כַּנְרִית κενερωθ BΘ
 (the κ may be a test of originality; as the older pre-Septuagintal loan-words
 prove, כ was transliterated as κ, ת as τ, and פ as π; comp., however,
 χενερωθ i); all the other texts have χεννερεθ, the form singularized and
 accomodated to other passages. The double ν (ro) is, of course, correct;
 χενναρεθ o with α is certainly defensible, but may be an inner-Greek variant
 due to similarity of sound (a source of frequent error transforming a singular
 into a plural in verb-forms and *vice versa*); χενερεθθι A is assimilated to
 χερεθθι (כַּנְרִית) || 22 πεδινη KR 11^{UF} for πεδιον was apparently taken from one
 of the three, comp. כַּנְרִית S^m on και εις την αραβα || 22/23 εις φεν-
 ναεδωρ] For כַּנְרִית 11^m, 11^e probably read כַּנְרִית, comp. 12:23.
 Origen wrote ναφεθδωρ (from which ναφεδδωρ, ναφεδωρ were easily developed)
 = כַּנְרִית, comp. כַּנְרִית 17:11. In view of μαφετα B in the passage
 just mentioned which it is easy to correct into ναφετα, I believe that the
 original of Θ had ναφεδωρ, and that it was corrupted through transposition
 into φανεδωρ or φεναδωρ (comp. כַּנְרִית S here) to which all the other
 variants are reducible. εδδωρ may stand for εν δωρ (comp. ro and UF) =
כַּנְרִית. ε may, however, represent an original θ; then, of course, ναφεθ-
 δωρ (with θ) was the original. The corrupt reading was retained by the
 K texts. σεφενα ενδωρ o is corrupted from εις (=εις) φενναενδωρ; in r an
 irrational σ was inserted: σεφεσνα. UF have the correct σεφέννα by the
 side of εις || 24/25 K shares with r an omission which is clearly due to
 homoioteleuton. Θ joined the last word of vs. 2 to vs. 3; the translator's
 knowledge of Hebrew thus reveals itself as exceedingly poor. Certainly

K 161b		εις τους [παραλι-]	XI
	25	ους ³ χορρα[ιους και]	3
162a		αμορρ]αιους· και	
		[ευαιο]υς και ιε-	
		[βουσ]αιους και	
		[φερ]εξεους· τους	
	5	[εν τ]ω ορι· και χετ-	
		[ταιο]υς τους υπο	

και εις ναφεθδωρ s | 25 χορραιους Kr \mathfrak{L} | prim τους χαναναιους απο ανατολων και τους παραλιους [[χανανεους ο | απ ο]] os | χορραιους Kro \mathfrak{L} | χοιραιους s

162a 2 εναιους R] *eucheos* \mathfrak{L} | 3 -αιους Krs] -εους ο | 4 -εξεους Ko] -εζαιους rs | 5 ορι K] ορει R | 8 γην R] την \mathfrak{L} | μωσαν K] μωσαν s: βωσαν r:

φανναενδωρ z : φεγαενδωρ rell | 24/25 [παραλι]ους + χαναναιους απο ανατολων· και εις τους παραλιους

162a [αμορρ]αιους] prim τους | 2-8 τους χετταιους τους υπο την ερημον εις την μασφομ· και τους φερεζαιους τους εν τω ορει· και τους ιεβουσαιους τους εν

יִשְׂרָאֵל \mathfrak{S} : ναφεδδωρ h : ναφεδωρ A*G* : ναφεθδωρ A¹ΘΛG¹ (θ superscr) | 24 —

162a 8 εις τους παραλιους χαναναιους απο ανατολων και εις τους παραλιους αμορραιους και εναιους και ιεβουσαιους και φερεζαιους τους εν τω ορει· και τους χετταιους τους υπο την ερημον εις την μασεμμαν [[εναιους, ιεβουσαιους, φερεζαιους] φερεζαιους, εναιους, ιεβουσαιους \mathfrak{C} | ερημον] + εν τω ορει \mathfrak{C} : + και \mathfrak{C} | μασεμμαν

יָם הַיָּבֵשׁ וְיָם הָאֲדָמִי cannot mean “by the sea the Canaanite at the east, and by the sea the Amorite”; the translator covered up the awkwardness of the Hebrew by the use of a Greek adjective: *παραλιος*. Neither of the two recensions, however, dared to alter the text, though the correct translation was available in σ’ (comp. \mathfrak{S}^m). יָם הַיָּבֵשׁ of \mathfrak{S} may seem to be a slight adaptation to \mathfrak{H}^m ; but probably it is an error (σ’ likewise omits the י) || 25 The Horites (concerning whom see E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, 330-345; Gemoll, *loc. cit.*, 349 ff.) are peculiar to the K recension; textually, הָרִי is a pendant to הָרִי later on || The order of the nations after the Amorites is the same in Origen (and thence also in \mathfrak{UF}) as in \mathfrak{H}^m : הָרִי, פְּרִז, יְבוּסִי, הָרִי, while the K recension follows the order of the current Greek texts: הָרִי, יְבוּסִי, פְּרִז, הָרִי (\mathfrak{C} alone deviates from the order of the B texts with an arrangement of its own). While \mathfrak{UF} reintroduce the Hebrew order, their text is complicated in that they retain with הָרִי, though they place it first, all that follows הָרִי in the form of B (with the readings *ερημον* and *μασφομ*), while after הָרִי which they place last they

K 162a

[την] ερημον εις

XI

[γην] μωσαν :

[⁴Και ε]ξηλθον αι πα-

4

10 [ρεμ]βολαι αυτω

[και ο]ι βασιλεις αυ-

βωσαν ο: μασσοαμ ℒ | 9 ¶ Kr | 9/10 αι παρεμβολαι αυτων [|αι] ε ο]] Kr| αυτοι

τω ορει· και τους εναιους τους υπο την αερμων εις την μασσηφαθ [|τους 2^ο] >
u | εις 1^ο] > iz | την 1^ο] > p | μασφομ| μασφωμ u | τους εν τω ορει 2^ο] > iz | μασ-

B℄ μασεχεμ ℄ : μασεμμαθ h : μασσηφα h²] Bh℄℄ : εις τους παραλιους
χαναναιους(·) απο ανατολων· και εις τους παραλιους αμορραιους· και τους
χετταιιους(·) και φερεζιαιους(·) και ιεβουσαιους τους εν τω ορει· και τους εναιους
υπο την αερμων εις την μασσηφα· [|αμορραιους sup ras A³¹] χαναναιους A* |
φερεζιαιους] prm τους Θ | υπο] prm τους ΑΘ | την 2^ο] γην Δ | μασσηφα] |
μασσηφαθ Α]] ΑΘΔΓΞ (l. 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤕 pro 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤔) | 8 ¶ Θ | 9/10 αι πα[ρεμ]βολαι

give what follows the Hexaplar form (with the readings αερμων and μασσηφαθ). Hence UF=KR+Hexaplar modifications worked into that recension. Note how בדר is added both to פרי and יבוס, to the former in conformity with the K recension, to the latter in accordance with the Hebrew || 7 ερημον is, of course, an inner-Greek error for ερμων || 8 γην R comp. την γην Δ is to be restored everywhere in the place of την. What favored the change of Γ to Τ was the circumstance that Mizpah occurs elsewhere as a city || How 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔 was transliterated by Θ, hides itself in the κοινή variants which are at first sight baffling especially if we include the variants in vs. 8 (163a, l. 7), though ℒ^m points there 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔 :

B℄	h	℄	K	Γ	ο	ς	ℒ	UF
μασευμαν	μασεμμαθ	μασεχεμ	μωσαν	βωσαν	βωσαν	μωσαν	μασσοαμ	μασφομ
μασσωχ	μασωχ		μασφαν	μασφαμ	μασφαν	μασσηφα	μοσφα	μασφοαμ

In the lower line, s comes near the Hexaplar form (μασσηφα(θ)) which (see above) is found in UF in the first place by the side of the other form. The Hexaplar form may be paralleled elsewhere in the Greek Bible; in this book comp. 18:26 μασσημα (B), μασσηφα (GA) (roℒAΘ have, however, μασφα). It is not easy to explain the form (confusion with 𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔?). It is clear, however, that the κοινή forms shown in the table exhibit no trace of η. It is just as manifest that in the three columns on the left the silent 𐤕 is represented by ε, whereas in the remaining columns to the right no vowel corresponds to it at all. With a view to the reading of ℄, the reading of h (with one σ) in the lower line is certainly to be preferred to that of B (with double σ); moreover, ω stands for ο which latter was a graphic error for ε.

K 162a

[των] μετ αυτω
 [ωσπ]ερ η αμμος
 [της θ]αλασσης τω
 15 [πλη]θει· και ιπποι
 [και α]ρματα πολ-
 [λα σφ]οδρα· ⁵ και
 [συνε]βαλον παν-

XI

5

ℒ | 15 -θει Ks] -θη r (per compendium o) | 18 [συνε]βαλον Kro] συνηλθον sℒ |

σηφαθ u¹ (σ superscr)lt | μασσιφαθ p : μασηφαθ u^{*F} || 9 ¶ | 14 της θαλασ-
 σης] prm η επι το χειλος [[η]>fi | επι] παρα p || | 17 ¶ | 18 [συνε]βαλον]
 συνηλθον | 20 παρεγε-] εγε- iz

αυτων] αυτοι omn | 12 αυτω B rell]+λαος πολυς Δ et sub ※ G§ | 14 [της
 θ]αλασσης Bh℄E] prm η επι το χειλος [[επι] παρα A]] AΘΔG§ | 15-17 και—

On the other hand, in the upper line B with -αν is correct, and ℄ with -εμ corrupt. χ is apparently a mistake for φ to which the consonants of Bh in the upper line also seem to lead. μ stands for β, and so does ν; the latter interchange clearly points to the spirantic pronunciation of β, and this shows that the original was φ. Hence we obtain μασεφαν as the reading underlying Bh℄E. As for that of the K recension, its correct form appears to be preserved in μασφαν Ko (and with ν corrupted to μ in r; ν, however, should be deleted, comp. ℒ; it was introduced from the parallel passage where it belongs of right: accus. ending) in the lower line; μασφοαμ uF is a cross between μασφαμ and μασφομ uF upper line; the α is, of course, correct; μασσοαμ ℒ < μασοαμ < μασφαμ (o < φ). The form underlying the readings of Kr in the upper line was clearly μοοσαν < μοφσαν < μωσφαν comp. μωσφα ℒ lower line < μεφσα(ν) < μεσφα(ν) (o < ε) || 10-12 In the place of **וַיִּהְיוּ** ℒ^m, ℒ^z read **וַיִּלְכְּדוּ**, hence αυτοι και οι βασιλεις αυτων, which Origen allowed to stand. Not so the K recension (all except ℒ) which inserted αι παρεμβολαι αυτων = **וַיִּהְיוּ**, but in the process lost αυτοι = **וְ** || 13 **עַם רַב**, which is an apposition to **וַיִּהְיוּ**, naturally was wanting in ℒ^z; it found a place in the Hexapla (a mechanical procedure which may be paralleled in other cases), but not in the K recension || 14 Origen likewise inserted **אֲשֶׁר עַל שַׁפָּת** which ℄ did not read or else omitted by way of condensation. No signs were used by him, hence the presence of the plus in AΘ. It was also introduced in uF || 18 συνεβαλον Kro and Origen. From an unknown source, since α' σ', according to Maes, wrote (not ωμολογησαν—the Greek is his from the Syriac—but) συνεφωνησαν (comp. ℄ Gen. 14:3; α' has there συνεβαλον, whereas σ' writes συνηλθον). All the other

K 162a

[τες οι] βασιλεις ου-
 20 [τοι κ]αι παρεγε-
 [νουν] α επι το αυ-
 [το κα]ι παρενεβα-
 [λον ε]πι του υδα-
 [τος μ]αρων πολε-
 25 [μηςαι] προς ιηλ'.

XI

162b

⁶ Και ειπεν κς̄ προς
 ιν̄· μη φοβηθης
 απο προσωπου αυ-
 των· οτι αυρῑ
 5 την ωραν ταυτη̄
 παραδιδωμι αυ-

6

22/23 παρενεβα[λον] Kro^u | + επι το αυτο s | 24 μαρων Kro] μερρων ^u: μερρωμ s
 162b 1 ¶ Krs | ειπεν Krs | ειπε ο | 2 φοβηθης K] φοβηθεις το: φοθης s | 6 πα-

162b 5 τη ωρα ταυτη iz | 6 παραδιδωμι prn εγω | ιηλ prn (των pt)

σφοδρα] > ^εfh | 17 ¶ Θ | 18 [συνε] βαλον AG^s] συνηλθον B rel | 19/20 ου[τοι]
 hAΘAG^s] αυτοι B : αυτων ^εfh | 19/21 ουτοι και παρεγενοντο] > ^ε | 21/23 επι
 το αυ[το] και παρενεβα λον Bh^εε] ~ AG^s : προς αυτον και παρενεβαλον
 επι το αυτο A : επι το αυτο Θ | 24 [μ]αρων μαρρων B^εε : μαρρωμ h¹ : μερρων
 AΛ^s (,عز) : μερρω Θ : μερρωμ h*G | 25 προς] τον omn (sed عزر s)

162b 1 ¶ BhAΘ | 4 αυρῑ[v] B rel] prn την G | 5 την ωραν ταυτη[v]
 [[την] > G] AΘAG^s] ~ Bh | 6 παραδιδωμι prn εγω omn | 6-8 αυτοις τετρ.

texts (B, ^{uf}, s^u, also AΘ) have συνηλθον. Hebrew יִרְיֶה || 19/20 αυτοι B (comp. αυτων ^ε) undoubtedly an error for ουτοι || B and its consorts place יִרְיֶה after יִרְיֶה; so also the K recension. Origen changed the order to accord with ^um. The uncertainty of position led some scribes to write επι το αυτο twice, both before and after και παρενεβαλον; so s and apparently the archetype of AΘ, only that A changed the first into προς αυτον, while Θ omitted και παρενεβαλον επι το αυτο through homoioteleuton || 24 The transliteration of יִרְיֶה (comp. also 162b, l. 17) oscillates between μαρρωμ (μαρρων, μαρων) and μερρωμ (μερρων, μερρω). The former was written by ^ε and retained by Kro, the latter apparently belongs to Origen. Either presupposes יִרְיֶה; for the α of ^ε comp., e.g., μαχαναρεθ Deut. 3:17 B || 25 προς ιηλ expresses the Hebrew more faithfully than τον ιηλ which ^ε wrote and which Origen apparently suffered to remain

162b 4/5 αυριον την transposed in G, an error || 6 εγω was left out by

K 162b

τους τετροπω-
μενους εναντιῶ
ἱῆλ'· τους ιππους

XI





10 αυτων νευροκο-
πησεις· και τα αρ-
ματα αυτων κατα-
καυσεις πυρι· ¹και
ηλθεν ο λαος· και




7

15 πας ο λαος ο πολεμι-
στης· επ αυτους ε-
πι το υδωρ' μαρω
εξαπεινα· και ε-
πεσον επ αυτους

ραδιδωμ K] prm εγω R^L | 2/3 τετροπωμενους Ks] τετροπομενους ro | 9 ἱῆλ K^{ro} | prm υἱων s | 11 -πησεις Krs] -πησις o | 14 ο λαος K] ἰς R^L | 17 μαρω[ν] K^{ro}] μερρων ^L : μερρων s | 18 εξαπεινα R | 18/19 επεσον Ks] επεσεν ο : επεπεσεν

υἱων | 14 ¶ | ο λαος] ἰς | 18/19 επεσον] επεπεσεν u : επεπεσον rell

hAΘAGS] ~B | αντους] παντας αντους Δ et sub ✕ GS | 7/8 τετροπωμενους B rell] τετρωμενους Δ :  S ( S^m) | 8 εναντιο[v] B rell] εναντι h | 9 ἱῆλ] prm του B cf. CCS : prm υἱων AΘA et sub ✕ G : prm παντος h | 11, 13 -πησεις, -καυσεις] pl. C | 13 πυρι] prm εν BhΘ | ¶ BhAΘG | 14 ο λαος] ἰς omn | 16 επ αυτους BhCCEAΘ] prm μετ αυτου ΔG et sub ✕ S | 17 μαρω[ν]] μαρρων BCEA : μαρρωθ Θ :  S : μαρρων Gh¹ : μερρων Δh* | 18/19 επεσον] επεσαν A : επεπεσαν B (pl. CC)ΔG(pl. S)Θ¹ : επεπεσαν hΘ* | 19 επ αντους Bh ( S)] αντους AΘAG | 20 εν τη ορινη] sub -

the scribe of K || παντας was omitted by G; Origen alone supplied it || 7/8 τετροπωμενους all but Δ is evidently an old error ("quod emendatum ita esse credo a sciolo nescio quo" Drusius) for τετρωμενους (the reading is found in 16; 82; F; Ald.; Compl.;  S^t apparently is meant for τετροπωμενους, while  S^m expresses τετρωμενους) || 9 υἱων which G has sub ast is wanting in H^m. Did H^m read צבא צבא? Nor does παντος h correspond to an element in H^m || 14 ο λαος K is a clear error (the identical error 5, 9 C^T); perhaps ἰς was miswritten ἱῆλ which is frequently paraphrased by ο λαος || 16 μετ αυτου =  S was added by Origen alone || 18/19 The manner in which the codices divide within one group on the question of number, shows that we are dealing with individual vagaries of scribes. The vulgar form with α is apparently the original; the K recension substitutes the classical

K 162b	¶ ^C	20	εν ¶ τη ορινη· ⁸ και παρεδωκεν αυτους κ̄ς υποχειριους τω ῑηλ· και επατα- ξαν αυτους· και	8 XI
163a		25	κοπτοντες αυτους κατεδιωκον εως σιδωνος της με- γαλης· και εως μασερημωθ' απο	

r : inuasit ¶ | 19 αυτους KR] + timor ¶ | 20 ορινη KR] ορινη ο : ορεινη s | ¶ rs
| 23/24 και επαταξαν αυτους KR] > ¶ | 24 -ξαν Ks] -ξεν ro | 25 —

163a 1 αυτους κατεδιωκον KRo¶] ~ s | 2 σιδωνος Krs] σιδωδονος ο | 4
μασερημωθ Ks] μασεριμωθ ro : μαζερωθ ¶ | 4/5 απο θαλασσης KR] > ¶ |

163a 4 μασερεμωθ | 7 μασφαν | μασφοαμ | 12 διασεσωσμενον uf |

GS : εκ της ορεινης ¶ | 23 τω] > omn | 23/24 και επαταξιν αυτους] > omn |
κοπτοντες B rel] κατεκοπτον και h

163a 1 κατεδιωκον] + αυτους AAGS | 4/5 μασερημωθ απο θαλασσης]

form with ο. The compound is manifestly right: επεπ- became through haplography επ-. ¶ with its timor stands alone || 20 εν τη ορεινη, sub obelo Origen, = ברה (after ברה) || 23/24 και επαταξαν αυτους, peculiar to the K recension, represents a pendant to και κοπτοντες αυτους from some other version || 25 —

163a 1 h coördinates || κοπτοντες αυτους κατεδιωκον This is good Greek style; the pronoun placed between the two verbs goes with both. Origen, however, added a second αυτους || 4 מַסְרֵפּוֹת בְּיָמָיו was reproduced by Origen (and hence in AΘ) as μασερεφωθ μα(ε)ιμ; in 13, 6 G alone reads μασερεφωθμαιμ, while ΑΑ have μασερεφωθμα(ε)ιμ and Θ μασσερεφωθμαιμ (σ dittographed). The κοινή readings of both passages present themselves as follows:

B ^{Ch}	¶	KRUF	
μασερων	μασερωθ	μασερημωθ απο θαλασσης	
		ε UF	
B	h	ro	UF
μασερεθμεμφωμαιμ	μασεραιθμεμφωμαιθ	μαρεεσεφωθιν	μασεφωθεμμα
			μασερεφωθαμ
			μασερεφωμαιθ iz

In the latter passage, the reading of ¶ is corrupt: mū'āla (^cma'ala; Dillmann emends ma'as) σερεθ μαιμ. It is clear that in B μεμ is a pendant to

K 163a

5 θαλασσης· και ε-
 ως των πεδιων
 μασφαν κατα α-
 νατολας· και εκο-
 ψαν αυτους· εως
 10 του μη καταλει-
 φθηναι εξ αυτων
 σεσωσμενον· και
 διαπεφευγοτα·
⁹ και εποιησεν αυ-
 15 τοις ις· καθοτι ειπε̃

XI

9

6 πεδιων K] παιδιων S: πεδιων ro: *campus* ℒ | 7 μασφαν Ko] μασφαμ r: μοςφα
 ℒ: μασσηφα S | κατα KOs] κατ r | 10 καταλει- Ks] καταλι- r: καταλη- o | 11 εξ
 αυτων KR] > ℒ | 12 σεσωσμενον Ks] διασεσωσμενον r: *saluus* ℒ: σεσωσμενους
 o | και KR] > ℒ | 13 διαπεφευγοτα Ksℒ] διαπεφευγοτας r: διαπεφευγοτας o |

13 πεφευγοτα z | 14 ¶ 1 | εποιει iz | 14/15 αυτους l | 15 καθοτι ufi] καθως z |

(των Λ) μασρεφωθ(?)μα(ε)ιμ (-μιν Λ) ΑΘΛΓΣ : μασερων Bh℄ | 6 πεδιων
 B rell (𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃 ℒ)] πεδιων ΛΓ | 7 μασφαν] μασσηφαθ G : μασσηφα ΑΘ :
 μασ[σ]ηφα Λ : 𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃 ℒ : μασσωχ B : μασωχ h : *masōh* ℄ | 9 -ψαν B rell]
 -ψεν Α | 11 εξ (habent ℄S?)] > B rell | 12 σεσωσμενον] διασεσωσμενον
 (-αν h) omn | 12/13 και διαπεφευγοτα h] > B rell | 14 ¶ hΑΘ | 14/15 αυτοις
 B rell] αυτοις h | 15 ις B rell] prm o Λ | καθοτι ΑΘΛΓΣ (𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃)] ον τροπον

μαιμ and that φω belongs after μασερε (in h the final μ has been replaced by θ; αι, of course, stands for ε); hence B read μασερεφωθμαιμ, the ε after σ (unless a faulty repetition of σ) expressing the $\frac{\sigma}{\sigma}$. The lower readings of roℒuf, corrupt as they are, seem to go back to two variants: μασερεφωθμαιμ (or -μην) roℒ and μασρεφωθμαιμ uf. In the present passage, απο θαλασσης = 𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃 was inserted by the K recension (all except ℒ) from σ' (according to Euseb. and S^m); while uf still express the constr. state, Kr reproduce the absol. state. The μ may be a corruption of β=φ (see above on 162a, l. 8); if genuine, then ℒ^s read 𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃, comp. 𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃 Jer. 31 (38): 39 *ketib* and transliterations in ℄. ℒ with its μασερωθ (z for s) comes nearer the original than the μασερων of Bh℄; it is apparently curtailed from μασερημ- (or φ)ωθ. 𐤒𐤍𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤃 has accordingly dropped out of the B texts || 6 Apparently πεδιων was written by ℄ (see above on 161b, l. 22) || 7 See above on 162a, l. 8 || 12/13 και διαπεφευγοτα of the K recension a reminiscence from the ground passage 8:22 || 15 ον τροπον was apparently written by ℄ || ειπεν

K 163a

XI

αὐτῷ κ̄ς· τοὺς ἱπ-
 πους αὐτῶν ἐνευ-
 ροκοπήσεν· καὶ τὰ
 ἄρματα αὐτῶν ἐνε-
 20 πρήσεν πυρὶ· ¹⁰καὶ
 ἐπεστράφη ἰς· καὶ
 πᾶς ἰῆλ μετ' αὐτοῦ
 ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκε-
 νῶ· καὶ κατέλα-
 163b βετο τ[ὴν ἀσῶρ·]
 καὶ τὸν β[ασίλεια]
 αὐτῆς· ἡ[ν δὲ ἀσῶρ]
 τὸ προτ[έρον ἀρ-]
 5 χουσα πα[σῶν τῶν]

14 ¶ r | 16 αὐτῷ Kas℥] > r | 17/18 ἐνευροκοπήσεν Krs] ἐνευρωκοπήσῃ ο: ἐνευροκοπήσαν ℥ | 19/20 ἐνεπρήσεν K] ἐνεπυρίσε(ν) r: ἐνεπρήσαν (s. ἐνεπυρίσαν) ἐν ℥ | 20 ¶ Ks | 21 ἐπεστράφη K] ἀπεστράφη R | 24—

163b 1 κατέλαβετο] *obsedit* ℥ | -βετο Kro] -βε s | ἀσῶρ R] *assor* ℥ (sed *asor* 3, 18; 164a, 15) | 3 αὐτῆς KR]+ἀπεκτείνειν ἐν ρομφαίᾳ ℥ | 4 προτ-

ειπῇ] ἐνετείλατο | 16 τοὺς] prm καὶ l | 19/20 ἐνεπρήσεν Uf] κατέκαυσε iz | πυρὶ] prm ἐν UF | 20 ¶ ul | 21 ἀπεστράφη UF

163b 3 ἡ[ν δὲ ἀσῶρ] | ἡ δὲ ἀσῶρ ἦν UF | 8 -ναν lf] νε(ν) upt | 8-9 παν[τα

B rell | εἰπέ[ν] | ἐνετείλατο omn | 20 πυρὶ] prm ἐν omn | ¶ BAΘG | 21 ἐπεστράφη] ἀπεστράφη Bh : ἐπεστρεψεν AΘG : ἀπεστρεψεν Λ | 21/22 καὶ— αὐτοῦ h] > B rell

163b 1 τ[ὴν] Λ et sub ※ GΣ] > B rell | 2/3 > h | 3 αὐτῆς] + ἀπεκτείνειν ἐν ρομφαίᾳ Λ et sub ※ GΣ | ἡ[ν δὲ ἀσῶρ] BΘAG] ὅτι ἀσῶρ ἦν AΘΣ |

Kr℥ comes closer to the Hebrew than ἐνετείλατο which Origen retained || 19/20 For טָרַף we find ἐμπιμπραναί, ἐμπυρίζειν, and κατακαίνειν. The plural in ℥ is faulty || 21 The active intransitive in Origen; the others have the passive. The forms with α are apparently original || 21/22 The plus in the K texts and h introduced from parallel passages || 24 —

163b 1 *obsedit* ℥ points to a variant || τὴν which expresses טָנָה both in Origen (but not in AΘ) and in the K recension || 3 הִכָּה בַּחֶבֶר which was missing in ℥* or else left untranslated by Θ by way of condensation was supplied by Origen sub ast (hence omitted in AΘ) whence probably it found

K 163b

βασιλεω[ν του-]
 των· ¹¹και [απεκτει-]
 ναν παντ[α τα εν-]
 πνεοντα [εν αυ-]
 10 τη εν φο[νω μα-]
 χαιρας· κ[αι ανε-]
 θεματισα[ν αυτην]
 και εξωλο[θρευσα]
 αυτους πα[ντας]
 15 και ου κατ[ελει-]
 φθη ενπ[νεον ε]
 αυτη· κα[ι την]

XI

11

Krs] πρωτ- ο | 6 βασιλειων Krs] βασιλειῶν ο | 8 [εν-]] εμ- R | 10 εν KOs] εμ γ |
 11 -χαιρας Krs] -χερ[as] ο | [ανε-] Krs] ανα- ο | 11/12 και ανεθεματισαν αυτην
 KR]>L | 12 -θεματισαν K] -θεματισεν R | 13/14 KL]>R | 15/17 και — αυτη
 KrsL]>ο | 15 κατ[ελει-] Ks] κατελι- γ | 16 ενπ- K] εμπ- rs | 16/17 [ε] αυτη

τα εν]πνεοντα] παν εμπνεον UF | 10/11 εν φο[νω μα]χαιρας] εν στοματι ξιφους
 UF | 13/14] > UF | 15/17 και — αυτη uf] > iz | 16/17 ενπ[νεον

6 βασιλειων B rell] βασιλειων C | 8 -ναν B rell] -νε(ν) AL | 8/9 παντ[α τα
 εν]πνεοντα] παν εμπνεον B rell | 9 [εν]] prm ※ ο : G cf. C | 9/10 [εν αυ]τη B
 rell]>Λ | 10/11 φο[νω μα]χαιρας] στοματι ξιφους AΘAGS : ξιφει BhC | 11/12
 και — αυτη[ν]]>omn | 13 εξωλο[θρευσα]] sg. AL | 14 πα[ντας]] sub - GS

its way to L || *οτι ασωρ ην* S (and so AΘ) faithfully reproduces the Hebrew; AG (and so UF) go with B in reading *η δε ασωρ ην*, of which *ην δε ασωρ* KR^L represents a graphic variety || 8 In the matter of number again individual divergences || 8/9 The plural and the article only in KR^L || 9 ο G sub ast expresses אִשָּׁר || 10/11 לַכֹּהֵן הָיָה appears as *εν ξιφει* in the B texts, *εν στοματι ξιφους* in Origen (also AΘ and UF), but *εν φωνω μαχαιρας* in KR^L which expression (with or without *εν*) is confined to C in five passages of the Pentateuch (Exod. 17:13; Num. 21:24; Deut. 13:15 (16); 20:13; 28:22) || 11/14 *και ανεθεματισαν αυτην* RUF, *και εξωλοθρευσαν αυτους παντας* all the others (B texts, Origen and texts dependent on him, L); K alone has both, that is a doublet. See above on 161a, ll. 15/16 || *αυτην* the city, *αυτους* the persons; the object which is not expressed in the Hebrew made explicit || *παντας* was obelized by Origen || 15–17 Condensation in oiz || *εν αυτη* which

K 163b

ασωρ' ενε[πρησε]

XI

εν πυρι· ¹²κ[αι πα-]

12

20 σας τας πολ[εις τα]

βασιλεων [τουτω]

και αυτους [τους]

βασιλεις αυ[των]

ελαβεν ις· [και α]

164a

[νειλεν αυ]τους εν

[στομ]ατι ξιφους

[και ε]ξωλοθρευ-

[σεν α]υτους ον

5 [τροπ]ον συνετα-

Krs]>L | 17 ¶ r | 18 ενε[πρησε] K | ενεπυρισεν rs: ενεπυρισαν oL | 19 εν KR
>L | 21 [τουτω] R]>L | 22/23 και — αυ[των] KroL]>s | 23 αυτους Kro]>
L | 24 αυ[των] Krl]>o

164a 1 -νειλεν rs] -νληεν ο | 3/4 εξωλοθρευ[σεν] KR] εξολοθρευσεν ro:

ε] αυτη] ~ uf | 18 ενε[πρησε]] ενεπρησαν uf | 19 ¶ u | 22 αυτους]
παντας uf | 24 ελαβεν] συνελαβεν uf

| 18 ενε[πρησε] CΛS] pl. B rell | 19 ¶ A | 21 βασιλεων B*hCΛS] βασιλειων
B¹ AΘG | τουτω[ν] Λ et sub ※ Gs]>B rell | 22 αυτους] παντας Λ et sub ※
Gs: >B rell

164a 2 [στομ]ατι ξιφους B rell] ξιφει C | 4 -[σεν] hCΛAΘAG] -σαν B rell |

is wanting in \mathfrak{H}^m all except L || 18 Note again individual divergence in the choice of number || 21 The same may be observed with reference to βασιλεων and βασιλειων (comp. the same variation above, l. 6); certainly the reading of the first hand of B (=hC), not to mention two representatives of the Hexapla (ΛS), agrees with הַבַּיִתִּים \mathfrak{H}^m (though הַבַּיִתִּים would have done away with the awkwardness of the present text) || הַבַּיִתִּים was apparently missing in \mathfrak{H}^s ; both the K texts (except L) and Origen (sub ast; hence the omission in AΘ) made the omission good || 22/23 The omission in s in all likelihood due to homoioteleuton || 23 αυτους Kro may be an attempt to ease the awkwardness spoken of above; Origen wrote παντας (=כָּל) sub ast (whence it was admitted to uf; properly wanting in AΘ) || 24 o is bent upon condensation || συνελαβεν uf comp. συναπεκτεινεν iz 161a, ll. 18/19

164a 3/4 The plural in the B texts and L || 7 Contrast 14 || 9-12 The passage is exceedingly instructive. In the first place we learn that it is

K 164a

[ξεν μ] ωνσης ο
 [παις] κῦ· ¹³πλην
 [πασας] τας πολεις
 [τας κ] εχωματι-
 10 [σμεν] ας· και εσ-
 [τωσ] ας επι των
 [θιν] ων αυτων
 [ουκ] ενεπρησε̃

XI

13

εξωλοθρευσαν \mathfrak{L} | 6 -[ξεν] K | -ξε R | -ωνσης Ks \mathfrak{L} | -ωσης ro | 7 ¶ rs | 9/10
 [κ'εχωματι[σμενας] K]ro | κεχωτισμενας s: *disruptas* \mathfrak{L} : + ā εστηκυιας εκ
 χωματος ὁ ιδρυμενας εκαστην επι νηους r | 10/12 και — αυτων KR | > \mathfrak{L} | 12
 [θιν] ων K | θεινων σ: θηνων r | 13 ενεπρησε[ν] K | ενεπρισεν R | 14 [εν π] νρι K

164a 7 ¶ l | 14 [εν π] νρι > υφ | 15 [ασωρ]] prm την i | μονην] +

6 μωσης G | 7 ¶ A | πλην] αλλα omn | 8-10 κεχωματισμενα] + αυτων Δ et sub
 ※ G (S^m 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535

K 164a	[εν π]υρι· ἰῆλ· αλλα	XI
15	[ασωρ] μνην ενε- [πρησ]εν ις· ¹⁴ και	14
	[παν]τα τα σκυ- [λα αυτ]ης προενο- [μεν]σαν εαντοις	
20	[οι υιο]ι ἰῆλ· αυτους [δε π]αντας εξω-	

>R 11 | 15 μνην Kro11 + αυτην s | 16 -[πρησ]εν K | ·πρισεν R | 20 [οι] Krs|>

αυτην uf | 17 [παν]τα > iz | 18/19 επρονομευσαν z | 19 εαντοις | αυτοις f |

αυτων|>omn | 14 [εν π]υρι |>omn | αλλα | πλην omn | 15 [ασωρ] | prm την Λ
et sub ※ G^s | μνην | + αυτην C A Θ Λ et sub ※ G^s (Λ transponit αυτην et
ενεπρησεν) | 16 ις A Θ A G^s | ἰῆλ B rell | 18 αυτης B rell | + και τα κτηνη hΛ et
sub ※ G^s | 19/20 προενομευσαν h¹ | επρονομευσαν Bh* rell | 19 εαντοις |
αυτοις Λ : >h | 20 ἰῆλ | + κατα το ρημα kũ ο ενετειλατο τω iũ || τω iũ | ις Λ || Λ

present I am in a position to adduce from an earlier passage in this book. 3:13 at the end r alone adds: α' σ' σωρος εις· θ' ασκωμα εν. I have also come across additions peculiar to r which though introduced sine nomine must be estimated in the same manner. Comp. 3:16 οικητον (after αραβα). On a different footing, however, stands ετοιμως *ibid.*, 17 which is extant in uf likewise. εκ in α''s rendering is evidently an error for επι (comp. S^m). On the other hand, σ' is fuller in r than in S^m. θ' (comp. S^m) is not quoted. There still remains a parallel anonymous rendering (εστωσας επι των θινων αυτων) which all the K texts (except 11) present as the second element of the doublet which is peculiar to the recension. Origen, on the other hand, proceeded in his usual mechanical manner by introducing from the parallel version just referred to the last word sub ast; the result (τας κεχωματισμενας αυτων) is awkward enough. What is the Greek for *disruptas* 11? || 14 εν πυρι K a singular reading. There is nothing in 11^m to correspond to it || 15 την Origen sub ast (hence not in AΘ) expresses אֶת || αυτην (s, uf, Origen sub ast, but also AΘ) expresses the suffix in לְבָדָה || 16 ις both recensions (also AΘ) = 11^m; ἰῆλ B texts || 17 In iz condensation || 17/18 All the texts express שְׁלָלָהּ in the place of הַגְּזֵרִים הַזֵּה || 18 הַחֲבֵהָהּ was supplied by Origen sub ast (hence its omission in AΘ) || 19/20 On προενομευσαν and επρονομευσαν see Helbing, 79 || 20 The addition in Origen comes from 8:27 || αυτους in all the texts is, according to Maes, an old error for αἰοῦς = ανθρωπους || 20 ff. The omission in iz is one of their extreme cases

K 164b

- 10 *εποιησεν· ου πα-
ρεβη ουθεν ρημα
απο παντων ὧν
συνεταξεν αυτω
μωνσης· ¹⁶και ελα-*
15 *Βεν ις πασαν την
γην της ορινης·
και πασαν την γῆ
ναγεβ· και πασᾶ
την γην εν τω νο-*
20 *τω· και πασαν τῇ*

XI

16

~**ℒ** | 10 ου K**R**] *pr*m *et* **ℒ** | 11 ουθεν K**S**] ουδε εν ro | 13 συνεταξεν K**S**] συνεταξε ο | αυτω K**R**] *illis* **ℒ** | 14 μωνσης K**S** **ℒ**] μωσης ro | ¶ K**R** | 16 της ορινης K**R**o] της ορεινης s: την ορεινην **ℒ** | 18 ναγεβ K**R**o] ναγεθ s: εν αγεβ **ℒ** | 18/20 και—νοτω K**R**o]>s **ℒ** | 19 νο- K**R**] νο- ο | 20 πασαν K**S** **ℒ**] >ro | 21 γοζομ

~uf | 11 -ρεβη] + ις iz | 14 ¶ ul | 18 ναγεβ] *pr*m την ufz | πασαν] > z | 19 εν] *pr*m την UF | 20 πασαν] > z | 20/21 την γην] > z | 21 γοζομ] γοσομ

ιησοι BA | 9/10 ις ουτως εποιησεν]~omn | 11 ρημα]>omn | 13 συνεταξεν B *rell*] ενετειλατο h | 13/14 αυτω μωνσης B**h**ⓈⓁ **ℒ**] *κς* τω μωνση (μωση G) AⓈG**S** | 14¶ B**h**AⓈG | 15 πασαν] *pr*m την A *et* sub × G**S** | την]>A**S** | 16 γην] + ταυτην A *et* sub × G**S** | της ορ(ε)ινης h] την ορεινην B *rell* | 17 πασαν] *pr*m την A**S** *et* sub × G | την]>A**S** | γῆν] hⓈAⓈA**G**] >B**S** : + την A | 18 ναγεβ hAⓈ] αδεβ BⓈ : νεγεβ A**G**(**S**) | 18/20 και — νοτω h]

משה נתן **ℒ**^m; whereas Ⓢ (B texts, K texts) read משה צוהו || 15 On την see above on 161a, 4-6 || 16 ταυτην=נתן added by Origen sub ast || Ⓢ probably wrote την ορεινην; see above (*ibid.*) || 17 as line 15 || γην properly omitted in B; it is simply a faulty repetition of την || 18 The corruptions of ναγεβ admit of easy explanation: in BⓈ, the initial ν dropped out by haplography (after την (γην)), just as in **ℒ** after εν (its text therefore read εν ναγεβ, comp. εν τω νοτω); the change of γ into δ (BⓈ) is due to an intermediate τ (comp. h 166a, 19/20); on the other hand, the interchange of θ and β (through the medium of φ)—comp. ναγεθ s—is an error of sound which may be paralleled elsewhere, comp. 165a, l. 3 χενερεβ Ⓢth for χενερεθ. Observe νεγεβ A**G** a more modern pronunciation than ναγεβ (also AⓈ) || 18/20 The parallel rendering of ואת כל הנהב in the K texts (all but s**ℒ**) and h is derived from a' σ' (see **S**^m); see above on 161a, 4-6 || 20 The omission of

K 165a

λασσης χενερεθ'

XII

κατα ανατολας

5 και εως της θα-

λασσης της αρα-

βα θαλασσης τῷ

αλων· απο ανατο-

ro | 6/7 αραβα K_{ro}] ραβα L | 7 τῷ[ν] K] > ro | 8 αλων K_r] ελων ο: nachor L |

ℰth: prm και ℰ | 5/6 θαλασσης] > ℰth | 6 της] > omn | 7 θαλασσης] θαλασσα

cannot be obtained from the scattered variants in Parsons' apparatus, it is advisable to present here the aspect in toto. 13 ¹ και ἰς πρεσβυτερος προβεβηκως ημερων· και ειπεν κς̄ προς ἰν· ἰδου γεγηρακας συ· και η γη υπολειπται πολλη εις κληρονομiam πολλη σφοδρα· αλλα διαδος αυτην ταις φυλαις του ἰηλ εις κληρονομiam· ον τροπον ενετειλαμην σοι· ⁷ και διμερισεν ἰς την γην ταυτην εν κληρονομια ταις ενnea φυλαις· και τῷ ημσει φυλης μανασση απο του ιορδανου· εως της θαλασσης της μεγαλης κατα δυσμας ηλιου εδωκεν αυτην· η θαλασσα η μεγαλη ορει· 14 ³ εδωκε γαρ μωυσης ταις δυο φυλαις και τῷ ημσει φυλης μανασση απο του περαν του ιορδανου· και 13 ¹⁴ τη φυλη λευι· ονκ εδωκε μωυσης κληρονομiam· κς̄ ο θς̄ ἰηλ αυτος κληρονομiam αυτων· καθως ελαλησεν αυτοις· 14 ⁴ οτι ησαν οι υιοι ιωσηφ μανασση και εφραιμ δυο φυλαι· και ονκ εδοθη μερις εν τη γη τοις υιοις λευι· αλλ η πολεις κατοικειν· και τα αφωρισμενα αυταις· και τοις κτηνεσιν αυτων· ⁵ ον τροπον ενετειλατο κς̄ τῷ μωυση· οντως εποιησεν ¹ ἰς ο του νανη· και ελεαζαρ ο ιερεις· και οι αρχοντες των π̄ριων των φυλων νιων ἰηλ· ² κατα κληρους εκληρονομησαν ταις ενnea φυλαις· και τῷ ημσει φυλης ³ απο του περαν του ιορδανου ⁵ και εμερισαντο την γην· ⁶⁻¹⁵ 18 ¹ και εξεκκλησιασθη πασα συναγωγη νιων ἰηλ εις σηλωμ· και επηξεν εκει την σκηνην του μαρτυριου· και η γη εκρατηθη υπ αυτων· 15 και κατεκληρονομησαν υιοι ιουδα πασας τας πολεις αυτων· και τας κωμας αυτων· κατα τα ορια αυτων· κατα δημους αυτων εμερισαντο την γην· 16 ωσαντως και οι υιοι ιωσηφ εφραιμ και μανασση· κατα δημους αυτων· κατεμερισαντο πασας τας πολεις αυτων· και τας κωμας αυτων· κατα τα ορια αυτων· 17 ³ και τῷ σαλπααδ νιω οφερ· ονκ ησαν αυτω υιοι· αλλ η θυγατες· ⁴ και εστησαν ενωπιον ελεαζαρ του ιερεις· και εναντιον τῷ νιου νανη· και εναντιον των αρχοντων λεγουσαι· ο θς̄ ενετειλατο δια χειρος μωυση· δουναι ημιν κληρονομiam εν μεσω των αδελφων ημων· και εδοθη αυταις κληρος δια προσταγματος κ̄ν· εν τοις αδελφοις αυτων· ¹ η δε γη γαλααδ ² εγενηθη τοις υιοις μανασση τοις καταλειμμενοις· 18 ²⁻⁴ (as far as διελειν αυτην) 8-10a. 11 19 ¹ 10a. 17a. 24. 32. 40 και εκληροδοτησεν αυτοις ἰς κατα δημους αυτων· κατα

K 165a

τα φασγα· ⁴και
 15 Οριον ωρ' βασιλε-
 ως βασαν· ος κατε-
 λειφθη εκ των
 ραφαιιν· ο κατοι-

4 XII

ασιδωθ ο | 13/14 την κατα Kto] > 14 ¶ r | 14/17 και—κατελειφθη Kro] και
 τον ωγ βασιλεα βασαν ος κατελειφθη s: και ωγ βασιλευς βασαν κατελειφθη 1 |
 15 ωρ K] ωγ R1 | 15/16 βασιλεως Kt] βασιλει ο | 17 -λειφθη Ks] -λιφθη r:
 -ληφθη ο | 18 ραφαιιν K1] ραφαν ro: γιγαντων s | 20 εδραιιν Ks] εδραιν r:

ωγ | 18 ραφαιιν] γιγαντων | 18/19 ο κατοικων] ος κατωκει | 20 εδραιμ u]

μηδων h | 13/14 την κατα] > omn | 14 φασγα] prm και 1 | ¶ BhAΘ | 14-165b,
 17 και — μανασση] > h | 15 οριον 5m] ορια A et sub × G : > B5 rell | ωγ
 omn | 15 βασιλεως AG (= οι γ' sec 5m)] βασιλεως G : βασιλευς B rell | 16
 βασαν] βασα B | ος 1AG5] > B rell | 16/17 κατελειφθη] υπελειφθη (υπολιφθη
 G) omn | 18 ραφαιιν (= σ' sec 5m 𐤓𐤁𐤁𐤀)] γιγαντων omn | 19 ασταρωθ B rell]

the final ρ stands for ν, exactly as 17:11 μαγεδδωρ A stands for μαγεδδων, and conversely 12, 23a ελδωμ B is corrupted from εδδωρ (comp. ενδων h and εδωρ 1) || 10 הַיְּשׁוּבִים בְּיָדָא is faithfully reproduced in GA5 (βηθασειμωθ A, βηθασιμων=βηθασιμω=βηθασιμωθ 5, βηθσειμωθ G) comp. also βιθσιμωθ h²=βηθσιμωθ); in the B and K texts בְּיָדָא is wanting, either originally, or through haplography after κατα (the element is universally extant in the parallel passage 13:20). As for the second part corresponding to הַיְּשׁוּבִים בְּיָדָא, the readings of the B texts and of AΘ are tolerably correct; not so those of the K texts which vary between εκμωθ (thus apparently the archetype read with 1) and κεδμωθ UF. κεδ- may represent a miswritten βεθ-; but εκ- remains a puzzle; contrast 13:20 || 11 νπο AΘ is an error for απο. και of Origen= 𐤕 𐤕𐤍 || 11/12 Krouf and h introduce a doublet which, according to 5m, comes from σ' || 12 την which the K texts excise treats הַיְּשׁוּבִים as an implied relative clause || 12/13 The correct ασηδωθ in the K texts and in AΘ; μηδωθ B (μηδων h=μηδω=μηδωθ) comp. vs. 8 A which it is not easy to account for; a conflation of the two readings underlies μησηδωθ (μεσιδωθ) GA; on 𐤍𐤁𐤁𐤀 5 see above on 161a, 6; note that in 13:20 G reads ασδω || 13/14 την κατα the K texts (except 1) || 14 ff. The omission in h apparently due to homoioteleuton || 15 The word 𐤒𐤁𐤓𐤀 which is represented both in the K recension (not 1) and in Origen (not 5¹) was wanting in 15; 1 accordingly took עַיִן as subject and בִּיתֵּר הַרְפָּאִים as predicate, a sort of circumstantial clause; Origen, even though, according to some copies (5¹),

K 165a

κων εν ασταρωθ'
 20 και εν εδραειν
 ὁ αρχων απο ορους
 αερμων· και απο
 σελκα· και πασης
 της κατα βασαν

XII

5

edrain 𐤀 : αδραιν ο | 21 αρχων Kro] αρχων s | απο KR] επι 𐤀 | ορους KR] οριον
 𐤀 | 22 αερμων Ks] δερμων ro: ερμων 𐤀 | 22/23 και απο σελκα K] και απο σελχα
 [[σελχα s]] R: *et fasga* (cum s inser.) 𐤀 | 23-165b, 7 και- εσεβων] > s | 23
 πασεις ο | 24 κατα βασαν Kr] καταβασεως ο: βασαν 𐤀

εδραιν lptf | 23 σελκα] σελχα | 24 κατα] > UF

ασθαρωθ G | 20 εδραιν B rell] εδραι G : αδραι Λ : ενεδραιν 𐤀 | 22 αερμων]
 𐤀 | 22/23 απο σελκα και] > G | σελκα] σελχα ΛS : άσελχα Α : σερχα Θ:
 σερχαι B 𐤀 | 23/24 πασης της] πασαν (απασαν G) την omn | 23 𐤀 A | 24 κατα]
 > omn

he left the current text intact, at least introduced a relative, which, of course, became a necessity in the K recension as well as in GΛ; the introduction of the relative should, wheresoever הַיִּנְיָ had been ignored, have necessitated placing הַיִּנְיָ in the accusative (comp. vs. 2); this was actually done by s, but a trace thereof remains also in G, the scribe at first starting to write the accusative and then correcting himself; the texts incorporating *οριον* or *ορια* naturally wrote the genitive; the latter, according to S^m, was found in the three; hence it is from them also that the noun determined by it came || 16/17 *κατελειφθη* is peculiar to the K texts || 18 *ραφαιν* of Kro 𐤀 was written, according to S^m, by σ'. Observe the misspelling common to ro which is not shared by the uncial (or 𐤀). Hence in such matters the agreement of ro is no guarantee of correctness || 19 *ασταρωθ* with τ is apparently the older method of transliteration; comp. the much older *ασταρτη* where the second 𐤀 is treated like the first; G modernizes || 20 𐤀 in all likelihood wrote *εδραι*; a supposed stroke of abbreviation over the final letter caused the pluralization at the hand of later scribes. ε is better attested than α. In the Greek underlying 𐤀 *εν* was dittographed || 21 All texts ignore 𐤀 𐤀 || The nominative was suffered to stand by s; by attraction to the relative clause || *απο* is probably an old error for *επι* (𐤀; 𐤀 omits the second *απο*); while the K recension consistently carries on the genitive construction, the other texts continue ll. 23/24 with the accusative || 22 Another instance where ro share an error; the archetype was certainly

K 165b

εως των [οριων]
 των γερ [γεσι και]
 του μαχ[αθι και]
 της ναχ[ι και του]
 5 ημισους [γαλααδ]
 οριου ση[ων βασι-]

XII

165b 2 των Ko] > r | γερ[γεσι] Kro] γαργασι 𐤀 | 3 μαχαθι Kr] μαχαθ η ο:
 machit 𐤀 | 3/4 και της ναχ[ι] Kro] > 𐤀 | 4 και Kro] > 𐤀 | 4/5 [τον ημισους

165b 1 των] > UF | 2 των] > z | γεργεσιν UF | 3 μαχαθι] μιλχαθι l | 4 ναχι]

165b 1 των] > omn | 2 των] > omn | γερ[γεσι] = γεργεσει B[ⓔ] | γεσουρι A[ⓐ]:
 γεσουρε Δ : γεσσουρε G : 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 | 3, 4 του sive της] την omn | 3 μαχ[αθι] =
 μιχαθ(ε)ι ΛG : 𐤍𐤕𐤁𐤕 𐤓 : μαχατι A[ⓐ] : μαχατ 𐤕 : μιχει B | 3/4 και της
 ναχι] > omn | 4/5 του ημισους] το ημισιν omn | 6 οριου 𐤕 | οριων B rel | prn

an uncial || 22/23 The omission in G due apparently to homoioteleuton || 23 σελκα might be original with its κ, but it is confined to K; in Θ, λ became ρ through mishearing (similarity of sound); σεκχαι B[ⓔ] goes back to σεχχαι and that to σελχαι (another instance of the interchange of λ and χ); we may even go further and say that 𐤕 wrote σελχα (comp. 13:11 αχα B after εως = σελχα), the ι was joined to α by reason of the following και; fasga 𐤀 (with inserted s) = φαγα (with spirantic γ, hence) = φαχα = φαχχα = φαλχα = θαλχα = εαλχα = σαλχα (in 13:11, however, 𐤀 has εσχα r. σελχα) || 24 κατα peculiar to Kro

165b 2 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 γεσουρει (or γεσσουρει, with σ dittographed, or with inner-Greek doubling, or with inorganic Semitic doubling, comp. 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕, 𐤍𐤕𐤁𐤕, 𐤍𐤕𐤁𐤕, μεσσιuas, etc.) was written by Origen (here GA have faultily ε at the end) and adopted by A[ⓐ] (13:2 Θ² placed ρ over the word apparently as a reminder of the other reading) here and 13:2. 11. 13a (13b G reads correctly γεσσουρ = 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 𐤕^m); the κοινή readings oscillate between γεργεσι (γαργασι)—so here all (γεργεσιν UF originated in the same way as εδραι out of εδραι, see above 165a, 20), and 13:2. 11 the r texts (including 𐤀 in vs. 2, but γεσηρι in vs. 11)—and γεσ(σ)ειρει (with itacistic variations; also γασιρι), the former by confusion with 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 (comp. Euseb.: αυτη δε εστι γαργασι), the latter = 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 || 3, 4 The genitive of the K texts expresses the sense of 𐤕^m correctly (observe the 𐤀 with 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓), or in consistency with the construction above 165a, 23; at all events 𐤕 placed a stop after 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 and took 𐤀𐤍𐤔𐤕 𐤓 over to the following which together the translator made

K 165b	20	οὐς ἀνει[λεν ἰς] καὶ οἱ υἱο[ι ἰηλ ἔ] τω περα[ν του ι-] ορδανου [καὶ της] ναχοι· κ[αὶ του]	XII
166a		[ημισο]υς γαλααδ [παρα θα]λασσαν [απο βα]αλγαδ εν [τω πε]διω του 5 [λιβαν]ου· καὶ εως	

23-166a, 9 καὶ — εἰρα]>s | 23 της Kro] εν 1 | 24 ναχοι Kr] ναχη ο: macho 1 | 24 —

166a 1 του ημισους] το ημισυ 1 | 1 ημυσους ο | 2 παραθαλασσεος ο | 3 απο βααλγαδ Kro] balladon 1 | 5 καὶ K 1 | 7 [χελ'εχ Kro] chelga 1 | 8/9 ση-

upz : ρουβιν ltfl | καὶ>z | 12 ¶ 1 | 22 του]>z | 23 της]>f | 24 ναχοι] ναθι iz: ναχθι rell

166a βααλγαδ u¹ ltflz] βαλγαδ u* : γααλγαδ i | 4 του]>f | 6 του 1^o]>UF |

BhAΘG | 19 των αμορραιων B^εth rell] της γης 5 | 20 ἰς sup ras A^s? (μουνσης A^{*fort}) | 23 —

166a 1 -καὶ — γαλααδ]>omn | 2 θαλασσαν] prm την A | 3 απο]>omn | βααλγαδ ΘAG5 (ⲉⲗⲁⲓⲁ) | βαλγαδ A : βαλαγαδ 6 : βαλαγαδα B : γαλααδ h | εν B rell] εως h² | 4 τω AΘAG]>B | 4/5 του λιβανου B^εChAΘAG5] λιβανω

adopted with Maes, the word not being found in the *κουη* texts), hence 16^ω must have read עֲבָרָה, an error due to the aberration of the eye to עֲבָרָה above || 7 K shows that *εσεβων* with one σ is the correct spelling. ε=ⲉⲥⲉⲃⲱⲛ || 8 *τουτους* the K texts (all except 1) resumptive || 9 Note condensation in z || 10 The plural should be restored also in Kr || 13 The second יְהוָה, עֲבָרָה only in Origen || κληρω all the K texts and AΘ is certainly to be rejected in favor of κληρονομια B rell; κληρος = ⲉⲕⲗⲁⲣⲟⲥ, and κληρονομια = ⲉⲕⲗⲁⲣⲟⲥⲙⲓⲁ || 14/15 ⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓⲁ, ⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁ, 6 did not express the gentilic || 16 ημισυ is not miswritten for ημισε; the difference is grammatical, see Helbing, 51 || 19 ⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓⲁ only in 5; all the other texts express ⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁⲓⲁ

166a 3 απο was wanting in 6; apparently ⲉⲃ was missing in 16^ε; for the translator's exegesis comp. note on 161b, 24/25 || Restore βααλγαδ everywhere; γαλααδ h (comp. γααλγαδ i) for βαλααδ, see above on 164b, 21/23; βαλλαδων 1 is gen. plur. of βαλλαδα, comp. βαλαγαδα B=βααλγαδ || 5 καὶ

K 166a

[του ορ]ους του
 [χελ]εχ' αναβαι-
 [νοντ]ων εις ση-
 [ειρα·] και εδωκε
 10 [αυτη]ν ις ταις φυ-
 [λαις ι]ηλ' κληρο-
 [νομε]ιν κατα
 [κληρ]ον αυτων
 [εν τω] ορι· και εν
 15 [τω πε]διω· και
 [εν αρ]αβα· και ε

XII

8

[ειρα] K] σσειρα r: σεηρα ο: seir 𐤀 | 9 𐤒 r | εδωκε ο | 10 [αυτη]ν Kr 𐤀 αυτοις
 ο | τοις ο | 11 -λης ο | 11/12 κληρο[νομε]ιν Kro 𐤀 κληρονομιαν s | 13 [κληρ'ον
 Kr 𐤀 κληρων s: κληρονομιαν ο | 14 ορι K] ορει R | 15/21 και—πεδιω] > s | 16 [εν]

7 [χελ]εχ fz | χελλεχ lpt: χελλεμ u: χαλεχ i | 8/9 σσειρα uF | 11/12 κληρονομιαν

B*vid | 6 του 1^o] > AΘ | του 2^o AΘΔΓ] > Bh | [χελ]εχ | χελχα B: χελκα h:
 χαλεκ (s. χαλεχ) 𐤀th: αλοκ AΘΔΓ: 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓 | 8/9 εις σηειρα] εις σσειρα AΘΓ:
 εις σηειρ B 𐤀: σηειρ h: ασσειρα Λ: 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓 | 10 αυτην h 𐤀 AΘΔ] αυτον BG 𐤀 |
 11/12 κληρο[νομε]ιν Bh] κληρονομιαν rell | κατα [κληρ]ον αυτων B rell]

which ro alone omit was certainly present in the archetype of Kro 𐤀 ||
 7 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓 Origen wrote *ααλακ* or *αλακ* (without the Hebrew article) (hence
 AΘ), read in ΛΓAΘ *αλακ* for *αλοκ*, comp. 11:17 *αλακ* A *ααλακ* ΓAΘ; 𐤀, on
 the other hand, wrote (a)χελκ or (a)χελεκ = 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓, comp. *α' μερίζοντος*:
 11:17 *αχελ* (*αχαιλ*) B^{chruf} with final κ dropped in front of *και*, here *χελκα*
 h 𐤀 (𐤀 with γ in the place of κ) and (with κ assimilated to χ) *χελχα* B, a in
 either case dittographed (the next word begins in *a*), *χελεχ* rofz (*χελλεχ* lpt
 with faulty doubling, still more corrupt *χελλεμ* u), *χαλεχ* i comp. *χαλεκ* 𐤀th
 || 8 *ασ*-Λ=ε*ς* for *εις*; the word is missing in h || 8/9 While B^{ch} 𐤀 comp. 𐤀
 correctly ignore the locative element already rendered *εις*, the other texts
 include 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓 pleonastically in the transliteration; η, of course, should be
 restored everywhere || 10 *αυτην* refers back to 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓; *αυτον* clearly an error
 in spite of the variant reading there, since the plural is used for the latter
 in Greek || 11/12 Kro 𐤀 go with Bh || 1B *κληρονομια* ο deviates from its
 archetype and is certainly wrong, even though *κληρον* is an inadequate ren-
 dering of 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤓 (*α' σ' διαιρεσεις*) || 16 There is room in K for *εν*, though

K 166a

[ασηδ]ωθ'. και ε
 [τη ερη]μω· και
 [νοτω]· και [εν]
 20 [ναγε]β'. και εν τω
 [πεδι]ω τον χετ-
 [ταιον] και τον α-
 [μορρα]ιον και τῷ
 [χανα]ναιον· και
 25 [τον φ]εραιζέον·
 166b και τον [εναιον]
 και τον ιεβουσαι-

XII

K?L] > ro | 17 [ασηδ]ωθ K] ασηδωθ r: αδωθ ο: esebon L | και] > ο | 18/19 και
 [νοτω] Kro] > L | 19 νωτω ο | 20 [ναγε]β K] nazeβ L : αγεβ ο: αγεν r |
 20/21 και—πεδιω Kro] > L | 21—166b, 4 των χετταιων· και των αμορραιων· και
 των χαναεων· και των φερεζων· και των εναιων· των ιεβουσαιων· και των γεργε-
 σαιων ο | 25 φερεζαιον r | 24—

166b 1 και—εναιον] > s | 3/4 και τον γεργεσαιον] > L | ¶ r | 5 και KR] > L |

UF | 18/19 και νοτω] (γη z) τη προς νοτον uf | 20 [ναγε]β lpt] αγεβ ufi:
 ναγεθ z | 21 πεδιω] + και εν αραβα και εν ασηδωθ i | 21—166b, 4 τον χαναναιον
 και τον χετταιον· και τον αμορραιον και τον καναναιον· και τον φερεζαιον και τον
 εναιον· και τον γεργεσαιον και τον ιεβουσαιον [τον χαναναιον] > i | και 1^o—5^o] >
 fz | και τον γεργεσαιον και τον ιεβουσαιον] > iz | και 6^o, 7^o] > f]

κατεκληρονομησεν αυτοις C | 17 ασηδωθ B rell] μηδωθ A | 18/19 και νοτω (cf.
 §ⁿ α' σ' [כנען]) > omn | 19/20 εν ναγεβ G : [כנען] S (Λ=19 om και —
 χετταιον, sed cf. 108, νεγεβ 108. Compl.): εναγεβ AΘ : ναγεβ BΘ | και εν
 ναγεβ] καφιατεβ h | 20/21 και εν τω πεδιω S sub ※] > B rell

166b 1, 2 εναιον, ιεβουσαιον] ~ C | 3/4 και τον γεργεσαιον] > omn | 4 τον

ro omit it || 17 ασηδωθ See above on 165a, 12/13 || εσεβων L an error ||
 18/19 και νοτω from α' σ' (according to §^m) anticipates και εν ναγεβ, a
 doublet peculiar to the K texts (all except L) || 20 For the corruptions of
 ναγεβ see above on 164b, 18. καφιατεβ h the three words run together with
 corruptions || 20/21 και εν τω πεδιω Krouf is found also in S sub ast; either
 repeated from above, hence i goes on still further; or, which is more likely,
 read και εν τη πεδινη [כנען], see above on 161b, 22 || 21 —

166b 4 UF deviate from the order found in all the others (which is that
 of §^m) in that they place כנען at the head of the list; nevertheless it is

K 166b

ον και τον γερ-
γεσαιον "τον βα-

XII

9

5 Σιλεα ιεριχω και
τον βασιλεα της
γαι· ή εστιν πλη-
σιον βαιθηλ' ¹⁰ και

10

7 γαι KR] *geth* 𐤀 | *εστι* s | 8 βαιθηλ Krs] *βεθηλ* o 𐤀 | και KR]>𐤀 | 9 των s |

166b 4 τον z] *prn* και *ufi* | 8 *βεθηλ* i | 10 τον βασιλεα]>f | 14 λαχης u |

prn και Bh 𐤄 | post nomina oppidorum Λ et sub ※ G' S add *ενα* | 8 βαιθηλ]

repeated once more (in the form of *καναναιος*) in the place which belongs to it || 3/4 *και τον γεργεσαιον* peculiar to the K recension (all except 𐤀; iz, however, excise also *και τον ιεβουσαιον*; note the inverted order in υf); comp. Maes: "Monet hic Syrus in nonnullis libris post τον ιεβουσαιον adscriptum fuisse *και τον γεργασσαιον*, sed hoc in Hebraeo non habetur" || 4 *και Bh* 𐤄 *ufi* an inferior reading, induced by the sequel || 5 ff. Origen alone added sub ast *ενα* after each city name || The codices escape the tedious repetition of *και τον βασιλεα* with each new name in a variety of ways; some begin condensing the text at an earlier, some at a later stage. It is safe to say that these contractions do not go back to 𐤄. As for B, its archetype evidently had *και* in each instance (see below); moreover, *βασιλεα* was written compendiously *β̄ā* (see below) || 10/11 *βασιλεα χεβρων* dropped out in G through carelessness; the total was not affected, because G erroneously treated *χερμελ* vs. 22 as the name of a city || 12 𐤀 alone reproduces יְרִמְיָהוּ 𐤎; all the others presuppose יְרִמְיָהוּ or יְרִמְיָה or (if *ου* stands for *ω*) יְרִמְיָה || 15 עֵגְלוֹן, introduced by Origen into his text as *εγλων* (hence A^Θ and also υf) in the place of the *κοινη* reading (as preserved in Bh 𐤄 𐤀) *αιλαμ*; the latter apparently meant to Origen a hopelessly corrupt form which he could in no wise admit. Critically handled, *αιλαμ* is equivalent to *αιγλαμ* (the spirantized *γ* omitted; comp. 17:3 *ela* 𐤀 and *γ* in *εγλα* sup ras B?) = *αιγλαν* = *εγλαν*. 𐤀 which kept the *κοινη* form added *βασιλεα gongola*; whatever the *γ* (*g*) may stand for, *ογγολα* is manifestly a corruption from *εγγελα* (comp. *εγγελα* Compl. = עֵגְלוֹן Jerem. 31 (78): 34; corrupted in the codices as *αγγελια*(v, s) = *εγγελα* = *εγγελαν*. s likewise adds: *και εγλωμ*; but in the place of the *κοινη* form, it reads with Kro *οδολ(λ)αμ*. Here reveals itself a substantial difference between Origen and the recension embodied in KR. A concordance of all the passages in which the name עֵגְלוֹן occurs in Joshua shows that, though the three gave a form corresponding to the


K 166b

	τον βασιλεα ιλῆμ'	XII
10	και τον βασιλεα χεβρων· ¹¹ και τῷ βασιλεα ιεριμουθ'·	11
	και τον βασιλεα λαχεις· ¹² και τον	12
15	βασιλεα οδολαμ'	

10 και KR|>℥ | τον βασιλεα K_{ro}℥|>s | 11 και KR|>℥ | τον|>ro | 11/12
τον βασιλεα|>s | 12 ιεριμουθ Ks| εριμουθ ro: ιερμουθ ℥ | 13 και KR|>℥ | τον|
>ro | τον βασιλεα|>s | 14 και|>℥ | τον|>ro | 14/15 τον βασιλεα|>s | 15 οδο-

15 οδολαμ| αιγλωμ UF: + και τον εριμουθ iz | 16 τον βασιλεα|>fi | 17 γαζερ|

γεθ'ηλ A | και|>omn | 9 τον|>omn | 10 και τον|>omn | 10/11 βασιλεα
χεβρων|>G | 11 και τον|>omn | ιεριμουθ| ιεριμου A : ιαρημουθ **Ⓢ** cf. *iarimulth*
Euseb ^{Hier} || 13, 14 και τον|>omn | 15 οδολαμ| αιλαμ Bh**Ⓢ** : εγλωμ AG:

Hebrew (comp. for 10:5 α' σ' θ' 85^m et sine nomine 58^m; for vs. 23 α' σ', for vss. 34 and 37 σ' **Ⓢ**^m; read, of course, everywhere εγλων), Origen conservatively retained the **Ⓢ** reading οδολλαμ; that is to say, if G**Ⓢ** may be taken to represent the Hexapla (or Tetrapla, comp. the note in **Ⓢ** at the end of the book). AΘ naturally followed Origen (in 10:37 there is an omission in Θ; comp. a similar omission in f). A doubt, however, may be raised as to what Origen really introduced in his text on the ground of the marginal note in 85 on 10:34 according to which both ο' and α' read αιγλωμ. This reading is extant in 15 (αιγλων). 64. Ald. (αγλων); and so also in vss. 5. 23; while in vs. 3 αιγλωμ is found in the text of 58. It may therefore be argued that in one form of his recension (possibly the Tetrapla) Origen was emboldened to introduce the correction. Observe that in vs. 33 where 85 vindicates for ο' the reading οραμ we find ωραμ (the better spelling) in 64. Ald. (comp. αραμ 58 and the still more corrupt reading  of **Ⓢ**). The entire subject, however, cannot be prosecuted here at length. So much is certain that, when Origen was forced to supply an omission, he unhesitatingly took over from his source the Hebrew form of the place-name; so in 10:36 ✕ απο εγλωμ: G**Ⓢ**, sine notis Λ (with the form εγλων in 19. Compl.). Whereas 58 presents the doublet απο αιγλωμ οδολλαμ, it is interesting to observe that in h**Ⓢ**^{CRUF} the addition reads απο οδολλαμ. Hence the other recension, while adopting the same plan as did Origen with reference to supplying suppositious lacunae in the current text, nevertheless held itself to the tenor of **Ⓢ**, a critical procedure which must excite admiration. AΘ, while accepting Origen's corrections, do not follow him in admitting asterisked additions.

K 166b

και τον βασιλεα
 γαζερ'· ¹³ και τον
 βασιλεα δαβειρ'
 και τον βασιλεα

XII

13

λαμ Ks] οδολλαμ ro : + και εγλωμ s : gongola 𐤀 | βασιλεα] prm regem aelam
 𐤀 | 16 και] > 𐤀 | τον] > ro | τον βασιλεα] > s | 17 και] > 𐤀 | τον] > ro | 17/18 τον
 βασιλεα] > s | 18 δαβειρ Krs] δαβηρ o | 19 και] > 𐤀 | τον βασιλεα] > s | 20 γεσσειρ

αζηρ ufi: αζηρ z | 18-22 ordo oppidorum Klptf] γεσειρ, ερμα, αραδ, δαβειρ
 u: omn inserunt βαιθηλ post αραδ | 18 δαβειρ] δαβιρ ulf: διαβιρ ptiz |

εγλων ΘΛΣ | 16, 17, 19 και τον] > omn | 20 γεσσειρ] ασει B : ται h : gīst 𐤀 :

The K recension is thus true to its canon in reading in the present passage οδολλαμ. On the basis of the κοινή reading and its casual correction in Origen the two names are identified in 58^m on 10:37: η οδολλαμ λεγεται και αιγλαμ. There remains the passage 15:39 where again the κοινή reading seemed hopelessly corrupt to Origen who therefore introduced the Hebrew form; he was not followed by the other recension. The introduction of οδολλαμ in 12:12 on the part of the K texts necessitated its excision from vs. 15; naturally those texts which read in the former place αιλαμ or εγλων kept οδολλαμ in the latter. The total XXIX of 𐤄 (Bh 𐤀𐤁) remained unaffected in ro by the addition of βαιθηλ in vs. 16 in accordance with 𐤀^m. In uf, the retention of οδολλαμ by the side of αιγλωμ together with the addition of βαιθηλ and the duplication of vs. 22b (to κοδμαν comp. κομμαν ro 𐤀 is prefixed the Hexaplar form ιεκοναμ) increases the number by three; hence λβ' u, for which r faultily have ιβ' (comp., however, 24:12 all texts except ΛΣ which read two with 𐤀^m and h which has twenty-nine!). Origen naturally counted XXXI with 𐤀^m; though the representatives of his recension are not in agreement with one another in vss. 18b. 19a. 20a, if we consult AΘ we may be reasonably certain that Origen wrote λεσαρων, μαδων, ασωρ, σαμρων μαρων. AΘ both count XXIX, i.e. they reproduce the κοινή reading, though A introduces a supernumerary φασγα after σαμρων, and Θ inserts βαιθηλ and λεπαρῶ (read λεσαρῶ) and treats μαρρῶ in 20a as a separate locality. 𐤀^s apparently wrote XXIX; the number was reduced by the omission of βαιθηλ and the contraction of vs. 18 (where 𐤀^s omitted the second בִּלְךָ; לְשִׁירֶךָ was then correctly understood by the translator after the analogy of לְשִׁירֶךָ 22b, לְשִׁירֶךָ 23a, לְשִׁירֶךָ—thus 𐤀^s read for לְשִׁירֶךָ 𐤀^m—23b: 𐤄 wrote εφεκ (or αφεκ) της σαρων; the corruptions in Bh 𐤀𐤁rouf may be readily explained: B, aside from the change of ε to ο, omitted one σ by haplography; in its archetype σαρων was written σαρῶ,

K 166b	20	γεσσειρ ¹⁴ · και βασι- λεα ερμυ· και βα- σιλεα αραδ ^{15a} · και βα- σιλεα λομνα· ¹⁶ και βα- σιλεα μακηδα·	14 XII 15a 16
--------	----	--	-------------------------

K] γεσειρ rs: γεσηρ o: γαζειρ ℒ | και|>ℒ | 20/21 βασιλεα|>s | 21 ερμα Krℒ |
ερμαν ro | και|>o ℒ | 21/22 βασιλεα|>s | 22 αραδ KR] ααραδ ℒ | και|>roℒ |
22/23 βασιλεα|>s | 23 λομνα K] λοβνα ro: λεμνα ℒ : + βασιλεα οδολλα ℒ |
και|>roℒ | 23/24 βασιλεα|>s | 24 μακηδα Krs] μακιδα o: mageda ℒ

20 γεσσειρ] γεσιρ viz: γαισηρ f | 22 αραδ] αραδι u | 23 λοβνα | inter λοβνα et
μακηδα inserunt οδολλαμ (οδολαμ f)

γαδερ AΘΛΓΣ | και|>omn | 21 ερμα] ερμαθ Bh℄ | και|>omn | 22 αραδ] αιραθ
βασιλεα αραθ B : αιραε β. αραθι h : αραθ ℄ : αδερ AΘΛΓΣ | και|>omn | 23
λομνα] λεμνα ℄ : λεβνα BΘΛΓΣ : λεβμνα A : + β. οδολλαμ ΛΓΣ : + β.
οδ. β. βαιθελ Θ | και|>omn | 24 μακηδα AΘΛΓΣ] ηλαδ B : αηλαδ h : ηδαχ ℄

the sign of abbreviation was then overlooked; on the other hand, the initial κ of the following και—the archetype apparently read και βασιλεα—was dittographed; h has *σαρωθ*, as frequently with *ō*; in *rouf* the τ of *της* became γ, and in *ro* the initial α was lost through haplography; in both the κ of *αφεκ* became γ pronounced ν before the following γ, hence the ν of *υf*; *αφεεκσαρρως* ℒ shows a dittographed ε, *της* is ignored, ρ doubled, ω rounded to ου, and θ (misread σ) as in h); on the other hand, the omission of 19a (גִּדְדִּי a mere variant of גִּדְדִּי 20a; see above on 161b, 10) was offset by the breaking up of 20a into two (ℒ^s read גִּדְדִּי גִּדְדִּי גִּדְדִּי || 17 *υf* stand with their *αζηρ* alone || 18–22 u stands alone with its order || 20 Correct *ταει* h to *γαει* and that (comp. B and ℄) to *γασει*=*γυσειρ* comp. *γαζειρ* ℒ and *γε(σ)σειρ* K texts. In all probability, ℄ wrote *γαδηρ*=גִּדְדִּי for גִּדְדִּי ℒ^m reproduced in Origen (and AΘ) || 21 *ερμαθ* of the B texts with archaic fem. ending רַחֵ— || 22 Bh clearly represent a doublet, which is proved not only by the omission of the first in ℄, but principally by the fact that the count of XXIX is not affected. *αιραθ* (corrupted in h to *αιραε*)=*εραδ* (ε for —) and *αραθ* (corrupted in h to *αραθι*)=*αραδ* are clearly parallels; perhaps the former is genuine || *αιραδ* ℒ with a dittographed after *βασιλεα* || *αδερ* Origen quite unlikely, unless ℒ^m read גִּדְדִּי; it may have arisen through assimilation to *γαδερ* || 23 On *λεβνα* and variants see above on 161a, 2 || Through the insertion of *βαιθελ* in the wrong place, the order in vss. 15 f is shifted in *υf*. Θ, not A, introduces *βαιθελ* in front of *μακηδα* || 24 ℄ wrote

K 167a

⁷Και τοις ημισει

7 XXII

φυλης μανασση

εδωκεν μωνσης

εν τη βασαν· και

5 τοις ημισεσιν ε-

δωκεν ις· μετα

των αδελφων

αυτων εν τω πε-

ραν του ιορδανου

10 παρα θαλασσαν· και

R 167a 1 ¶ r | τοις ημισει KR] τω ημισει 1 | 2 φυλης Kro 1 | +
 υων s | μανασση Krs] μανασση ο 1 | 3 εδωκεν Ks] εδωκε το | μωνσης Ks
 1] μωνσης r: ις ο | 4 εν τη Kro 1 | την s | 4-6 και—ις Krs 1] > ο | 5 τοις
 ημισεσιν Krs] τω ημισει 1 | 8-10 εν—θαλασσαν Krs 1] > ο | 11/12 απεστειλεν

ul(p)tf

167a 1-4 και—βασαν]>F (sed φυλης μανασση f superscr) | 1 ημισει

B 167a

1 ¶ AΘ | τοις ημισει ΘΛ] τοις ημισει A : τω ημισει B : τω ημισ
 h | 3 μωνσης B rell] ις Λ | 4 τη sup ras 3 circ litt A² | βασαν ΕΑΘΣ]
 βασαν(ε)ιτιδι BhΛ | 5 τοις ημισεσιν ΘΛ] τοις ημισιν A : τω ημισει B : τω
 ημισιν h | 8/9 εν τω περαν του ιορδανου BhΕΘ] παρα τον ιορδανην Λ : > ΑΣ |

μακηδαθ: μα was lost after βα (as βασιλεα was written compendiously), κ was lost through haplography in another ancestor which omitted βασιλεα and read in its source κ (= και) κηδαθ; what remained became ηλαδ (spirantic δ in B) and, with α of βασιλεα dittographed, αηλαδ in h; on the other hand, ηδαθ was misread (χ for λ=δ=θ) as ηδαχ in Ε.

167a 1-4 Omission through homoioarecton or condensation in F (but note the trace in f superscr); a similar condensation in o (see the variants 3, 4-6, 8-10) which inconsistently retains εν τη βασαν || 1 The plural all except Bh 1u; ημισει A probably an error, comp. ημισιν A in l. 5 which is certainly an error; hu refrain from declining; similarly l. 5 || 3 ις Λ is an error as it is in o, though there the error is coupled with condensation || 4 Bh followed by Λ Grecize the name; the K recension and Origen (the latter followed by AΘ) have the Hebrew form || 8-10 The K texts as well as the B recension present the full Hebrew text; there is no reason to assume that Origen had anything different; Σ (followed by A, but not by Θ) omits the first part, Λ the second (hence παρα τον ιορδανην for εν τω περαν του ιορδανου) || 11/12 The form minus the εξ- is peculiar to Kro || 12, 13 o con-

K 167a

ηνικα απεστει-
 λεν αυτους ις εις
 τους οικους αυ-
 των· ηυλογη-
 σεν αυτους ⁸ λε-
 γων· εν χρημα-

XXII

8

K] απεστειλεν r: απεστειλε o: εξαπεστειλεν s: *dimisit* ℒ | 12 αυτους Krsℒ] > o
 | 13 οικους Krsℒ] > o | 14 ηυλογη· K] ευλογη· R | 16/17 εν] *cum* ℒ | χρεμασιν

lpt] ημισν u | 5 ημισειν] ημισν u | 10 ¶ | 11 εξαπεστειλεν ultF | 14 ηυλογη·]

10 παρα θαλασσαν B rell] κατα θαλασσαν h : > Λ | ¶ B^{vid}h AΘ | 11/12
 εξαπεστειλεν omn | 14/15 ηυλογησεν] και ευλογησεν omn | 15/16 λεγων AΘ]

denses || 14 The omission of *και* in Kruℒ makes better Greek || The temporal augment with *εν-* only in K, see Helbing, 75 || 15 ff. In ℒ^s vs. 8 apparently read: *ובנחשים רבים שבו אל אהליהם ובנקנה רב מצא ונסה וזחב*: *ונחשת* (ו:נחשת) *ושלמות הרבה הלך שלל איביהם עם אהיהם* which I have placed in parentheses see on ll. 22/23. The principal deviation from ℒ^m consists in the reading *שבו* (minus the vowel letter) which taken as a perfect (*שָׁבָה*) entrained the pointing *הִלְכָּהּ* or *הִלְכִּי* and the change of the suffixes from the second to third person as well as the excision of *אֲנִי* *לֵאמֹר*. A less important difference was the dropping of the preposition in front of *בנקנה* and the following nouns which caused the translator to place the caesura at *אהליהם*. Such is the text and exegesis underlying Bh. A crude approachment to ℒ^m constitutes the introduction at the head in ℒ of *και ειπε προς αυτους*, the rest remaining as it is in Bh. Not less mechanical was Origen's procedure who left the text of the *κοινή* essentially intact except that he inserted after the first *και* the words *ειπε προς αυτους λεγων* (Lagarde follows Maes in placing *προς αυτους* alone sub ast; his Syriac MS reads: *ܐܝܬܝܢ ܠܥܝܢܝܗ ܕܥܝܢܝܗ ܕܥܝܢܝܗ ܕܥܝܢܝܗ*; neither is correct; for if we follow the lead of AΘ which retain *λεγων* and omit *και* we should have to place *και ειπε προς αυτους* sub ast; if, on the other hand, B is our guide then *ειπε προς αυτους λεγων* should be put sub ast; the decision rests with the determination of the exact relation of AΘ to Origen into which question I am not in a position to go beneath the surface at the present writing); if he at all connected any sense with the text thus established (and certainly AΘ must have wrested some sort of meaning from the text as read by them), he took as the subject of the two verbs not the half-tribe of Manasseh, but Reuben and Gad (the presumable subject of *επορευθησαν* in vs. 6). Accordingly, in

K 167a

XXII

σιν πολλοις ανα-
 λυεται εις τους
 οικους υμων
 20 και εν κτηνεσῖ
 πολλοις σφοδρα·
 και αργυριον και
 χρυσιον· και σι-
 δηρον και χαλκῶ·

Kr] χρημασι s: χρημασι ο* | 17 πολλοις Krs] πολλις ο: πολλης ο¹ | 18 -λυεται
 Ko] -λυετε rs | 17/18 αναλυετε Kr] ιτε ℒ | 20 εν κτηνεσιν K] εν κτηνεσι R:
 κτηνη ℒ | 21 πολλοις Kr] πολλα ℒ | 22 και Kr]>ℒ | 24 και χαλκον Kr]>ℒ

ευλογη: prm και ltr | 20 κτηνεσῖ] κτημασι u | 22-

και Bh: prm και ειπε προς αυτους ℄S | 17/18 αναλυεται] απηλθοσαν BΛ: |
 απηλθον Θ: εισηλθον h: 'ataḡū ℄: 𐤀𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁 | 19 υμων S] αυτων B rel | 20/21
 εν κτηνεσῖ πολλοις ℄] και κτηνη πολλα B rel | 21 σφοδρα]>h | 22/23 και
 σιδηρον και χαλκῶ] ~℄ΛS: και σιδηρον Bh: >AΘ: sub ※ S

dismissing Manasseh, Joshua informs them that Reuben and Gad were gone already and that it therefore was now their part to go likewise. This bit of harmonistic exegesis is on a line with that of Rashi who naturally was bound by the received text to introduce a minor modification. The K texts which with AΘ retain *λεγων* go a step further in assimilating the text to ℒ^m, though they diverge in details: KRUF introduce the imperative and the second person of the pronoun in the first half of the verse (*αναλυετε* characteristic of this recension; it certainly did not come from σ' who wrote 𐤀𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁 according to S^m), while they leave the remainder substantially the same as in B (except that the preposition is restored in front of 𐤁𐤕𐤁𐤁; ufi prefix *και* in front of *διδου* so as explicitly to dissociate the second half from the first; z left out *και* as it so often does); ℒ, on the other hand, goes on with the imperative and the second person of the pronoun in the second half of the verse as well, but introduces in addition the *κοινη* form at the end in the reading of ufi || 17/18 *ιτε* ℒ does not appear to reproduce *αναλυετε* but probably *απελθετε* || 19 𐤀𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁? S is probably an error for 𐤀𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁𐤁? || 20 *κτημασι* u seems to have preserved the original Greek, though etymologically the Hebrew might be rendered *κτηνη* || S 22/23 places *και χαλκον και σιδηρον* sub ast; this accords well enough with AΘ which omit the entire phrase; but Bh have at least *και σιδηρον* which reading is shared by ℒ; the other K texts go with Origen || 22 ff. z condenses

K 167b

και ιμα[τισμον]
 πολυν δ[ιειλον-]
 το· πασα[ν την]
 προνομ[ην των]
 5 εχθρων [αυτων]
 μετα τω[ν αδελ-]
 φων αυ[των:]
 9 και επορ[ευθησα]
 οι υιοι ρο[υβην]
 10 και οι υιο[ι γαδ']
 και το ημ[ισυ φν-]
 λης υιων [μανασ-]
 ση· απο τ[ων υι-]
 ων ιηλ' εν[σηλω]

XXII

9

167b 2 πολυν Kο] πολλυν rs: + σφοδρα s | 3/4 δ[ιειλον]το Kρ] διηλοντο
 (per compendium) ο: διειλαντο s: *dividetis* 1 | 3/4 πασα[ν την] προνομ[ην] K] *την προνομην πασαν* r: *την προνομην (προνομιν ο*) πασαν ο: την προνομην s: de praeda* 1 | 5 [αυτων] Kρ] υμων 1 | 7 αυ[των] Kρ] υμων 1: + και διειλοντο την προνομην μετα των αδελφων αυτων 1 | 8 ¶ r | 9, 10 οι > ο | 11 τω r | 12 υιων Krs 1] > ο | 12/13 [μανασ]ση Kρ] μαναση 1 | 14 εν K] εκ R 1 | [σηλω] Kρ]

167b 2 και — πολυν (σφοδρα)] > z | 2 πολυν] + σφοδρα | 2/3 διειλοντο] prm και υfi | 3/4 πασαν την προνομην] ~ | 6/7] > iz | 8 ¶ ul | 9 ρουβιν lt: ρουβ(ε)ιμ uf | 9-13 οι—μανασση] ουτοι z | 14 εν i] εκ rell | 16 τη]

167b 2 πολυν] + σφοδρα EAΘΛS | 2/3 διειλοντο h] διειλαντο B rell | 3 πασαν] > omn | 5 αυτων EAΘΛ: sub ※ S: > Bh | 8 ¶ hAΘ | και] prm και απεστρεψαν EA et sub ※ S | 11 ημσαι h | 12 υιων B] > hEAΘΛS | 14 εν

167b 2 σφοδρα omitted by BhKro 1 was apparently missing in S || 2/3 διειλαντο is the vulgar form; Kro as well as h have the classical aorist || 3 πασαν which is wanting in H^m only in Krouf || 5 αυτων was omitted by S, the article as so often doing service for the pronoun || 6/7 iz condense || 7 Origen alone added και απεστρεψαν sub ast; from him it penetrated into E || 9-13 z condenses || 9, 10 ο omits the article as elsewhere often || 12 υιων B and the K texts except ο which merely condenses, not in H^m || 14 εν S probably read בשלח, a shortened relative clause || σηλωμ hs 1 = σηλων comp. μαγεδδων for μαγεδδω (comp. שיילני and Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 187) ||

K 167b

15 εκ γης χα[νααν]
 απελθειν [εις τη]
 γαλααδ' ε[ις γην]
 κατασχε[σεως]
 αυτων· [ην κα-]
 20 τεκληρο[νομη-]
 σαν εν αυ[τη δι-]
 α προστα[γματος]
 κυ εν χει[ρι μωυση·]
 168a· [10 και ηλθ]ον εις γα-
 [λιλα]θ' του ιορδα-
 [νου η] εστιν εν
 [γη χα]νααν και
 5 [ωκοδο]μησαν οι υ-

XXII

10

σιλω ο: σιλωμ s: σηλωμ 𐤓 | 17 γαλααδ Kro] prm του s𐤓 | 19/21 [κα]τε-
 κληρο[νομη]σαν K] εκληρονομισαν rs: εκληρονομισαν ο | 23 χειρι Kr] manus 𐤓
 | μωση ro

168a 1/2 γα[λιλα]θ K] χαλιλαθ r: γαλιλαδ os: galilea 𐤓 | 4 ¶ r | 5-9
 οι—μνασση] >s | 6, 7 ρουβην, γαδ Kro] ~ 𐤓 | 6 οι >o | 7 τω r | 8 φυλης K𐤓 |

γην | 19-23 ην — μωυση] >z | 19/20 εκληρονομισαν

168a 1 ¶ l | ηλθοσαν | 4-23 η—ιορδανου] >z | 6, 7 ρουβην, γαδ] ~ |

Bh𐤂𐤓] εκ A𐤂 | σηλωμ h | 15 εκ γης 𐤂A𐤂] εν γη Bh𐤓𐤓 | 16 τη B] γην
 h𐤂𐤓𐤓𐤓: +γην 𐤂 | 17 γαλααδ] prm του 𐤂 | 17/18 γην κατασχεσεως] την
 κατασχεσιν 𐤂 | 19/20 εκληρονομισαν omn | 21 εν αυτη] αυτην B rell :>A

168a 1 ¶ A𐤂 | ηλθον B rell] ηλθοσαν A𐤓 | 1/2 γαλιλαθ] γαλιλωθ A𐤂𐤓
 (𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓) : γαλγαλα B : γαλααδ h𐤂 | 4 ¶ h A | 6, 7 ρουβην, γαδ

15 𐤂 manifestly wrote εν γη; εκ γης is an inner-Greek variant (the stages
 are εγ γη, εκ γη, εκ γης) || 16 γην was written by 𐤂 and then replaced by
 την; or 𐤂 wrote την γην, γην then dropped out after την || 19-23 z condenses ||
 19/20 The compound only in K || 21 εν αυτη the K recension in accordance
 with 𐤓^m; A omits the 'ā'id as superfluous in Greek

168a 1 The vulgar form in 𐤓𐤓𐤓 || 1/2 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓^m is reproduced
 exactly in A𐤂𐤓 (but 𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓); the singular of the K texts stamps it
 visibly as the name of a locality; in Bh𐤂𐤓 the name is corrupted (assimi-
 lated to other names: Gilgal, Gilead, Galilee; the last not a bad guess).

K 168a

XXII

- [ιοι ρου]βην και οι
 [υιοι γ]αδ' και το
 [ημισ]υ φυλης μα-
 [νασσ]η· εκει βω-
 10 [μον ε]πι του ιορ-
 [δανο]υ· βωμον
 [μεγα]ν τω ιδειν·
 [11 και η]κουσαν οι υ- 11
 [ιοι ιηλ'] λεγοντω-
 15 [ν· ιδου]ωκοδομησα
 [οι υιο]ι ρουβην και
 [οι υιο]ι γαδ' και το
 [ημισ]υ φυλης μα-
 [νασσ]η βωμον ε-
 20 [φ ορι]ων της χα-

+ υιων το | 8/9 μανναση 𐤀 | 11 βωμον Ks𐤀] > ο | 12 τω ιδειν Kr] του ιδειν s:
 in conspectu domini 𐤀 : > ο | 13 οι > ο | 14/15 λεγοντων Ksr¹] λεγωντων r* |
 14-168b, 1 λεγοντων—ιηλ] > ο | 16, 17 ρουβην, γαδ Krs] ~ 𐤀 | 17 τω r | 18
 φυλης] + υιων s | 18/19 μανναση 𐤀 | 19/20 ε[φ] Ks] επ r | 20 της K] γης rs

ρουβιν lti: ρουβ(ε)μι uf | 9-11 βωμον — ιορδανου] > | 12 τω] του | 13 ¶ 1 | 15
 ωκοδομησαμεν u | 16, 17 ρουβην, γαδ] ~ | ρουβιν lti: ρουβ(ε)μι uf | 20 της]

AΘΛΣ] ~ 11 τω] του omn: prm επι B (> B^{ab}) | 13 ¶ A |
 14/15 λεγοντων] > 𐤀 | 15 ιδου] οτι 𐤀 16, 17 ρουβην, γαδ AΘΛΣ] ~ Bh 𐤀 | 18
 ημσει B* hA | 19/20 εφ οριων της] επι των οριων γης B* : εφ οριων γης B^{a'vid'b}

None of the recensions followed σ' in treating the word as a common noun. Observe the slight corruptions in r (χ for spirantic γ) and os (δ for spirantic θ) || 4-23 The omission in z may be due to homoioteleuton; but probably at the same time it serves the purpose of condensation || 5-9 s condenses || 6, 7 The Hebrew order in Kro and in Origen's recension with its dependents; so also 16/17 and 169a, 5-7 || 9-11 The omission in ufi due to homoioteleuton || 12 Inner-Greek variants || o condenses || 𐤀 paraphrastic ? || 14 ff. In o the omission which is due to homoioteleuton serves at the same time the purpose of condensation || 18 υιων s an addition || 20 οριων of the three recensions (only h diverges) goes back to גְּבֻל 𐤀 in the place of גְּבֻל 𐤁 ||

K 168a

[νααν] επι του γα-
[λιλα] θ' του ιορ-
[δανου α] πο μερους
των υιων ιηλ.

XXII

168b

¹² Και συνηθροισθη-
σαν οι υιοι ιηλ' πα-
τες εις σηλω· ωσ-
5 τε αναβηναι και
εκπολεμησαι
αυτους· ¹³ και απεσ-
τειλαν οι υιοι ιηλ'
προς τους υιους
10 ρουβην· και προς
τους υιους γαδ'.

12

13

ℒ | 21/22 γα[λιλα]θ Kr ℒ | γαλιλαδ s | 23 [α]πο μερους K] επι μερους rs: *in parte* ℒ


168b 2 ¶ r | συνηθροισθη- ο | 3/4 οι υιοι ιηλ παντες Kr] παντες οι υιοι ιηλ
ℒ : παντες ο | 4 εις Kro] εν s | 4 σηλω Kr] σιλω ο : σηλωμ sℒ | 4/5 ωστε
Ks] ωσται ο : ωτε r | 5 αναβηναι Kro] αναβειναι s | 8 οι superser ο | 10/11 ρου-

γης | 23 απο] επι

168b 2 ¶]>ul | ; 4 εις] εν i | 7 ¶ l | 8-14 οι—γαλααδ] προς αυτους iz |

ⓈAⓈ : εν γη h | 21/22 του γαλιλαθ]>Λ | γαλιλαθ] Ⓢ : γαλιλωθ AⓈ :
γαλααδ BhⓈ | 23 απο μερους] εν τω περαν omn

168b 1 των]>omn | 2 ¶ BhAⓈ | και] prn και ηκουσαν οι υιοι ιηλ ⓈA et sub
Ⓢ : Ⓢ | 3/4 οι υιοι ιηλ παντες] ~omn | 4 εις] εν h | σηλωμ h | 5 αναβηναι
και] αναβηναι AⓈ : αναβαντας Λ : αναβαντες B rel | 6/7 εκπολεμησαι αυτους]

της K is an error for γης || 21/22 See above on ll. 1/2 || 21-23 Ⓢ : γαλιλωθ AⓈ :
Ⓢ = εν τω γαλιλαθ επι comp. 15. 18. 64. 128 || 23 απο (or επι) μερους all the K
texts; comp. μερος =  Exod. 32:15

168b 1 Origen's recension alone (thence into Ⓢ) added sub ast και
ηκουσαν οι υιοι ιηλ; either the first three words of vs. 12 were missing in ℒ^e,
or were omitted by the translator, the clause being merely resumptive of
the identical clause at the head of vs. 11; comp. the analogous case 10:41
(161a, 18/19) || 3/4 ο condenses || None of the recensions express Ⓢ : Ⓢ ||
5/6 Note the paratactic construction in the K recension; the infinitive was
written also by Origen, but he subordinated the second infinitive thereto

K 168b

και προς το ημισυ

XXII

φυλης μανασση·

εις την γαλααδ' τῷ

15 φινεες· υιον ελε-

αζαρ' του ιερεως

¹⁴ και δεκα ανδρας

14

των αρχοντων

των μετ αυτου·

20 αρχων εις απο οι-

κου πατριας απο

πασων των φυλῶ

ιτλ'· αρχοντες οικῶ

βην—υιους]>ο | 9-13 τους—μανασση] αυτους s | 10/11 προς τους υιους]>℥
 | 13 φυλης] + υιων r | μανασση ℥ | 14 τῷ K℥ | + τε R | 15 φινες ℥ | 17 δεκα]
 ι ro℥ | 19 των]>r | 19/20 μετ αυτου αρχων εις] αρχοντα ενα μετ αυτων ℥ | 21
 πατριας] prm et ℥ | 20/21 απο οικου πατριας]>s | 23 ιτλ] prm υιων ℥ | οικων]
 >ο

ρουβιν lt: ρουβ(ε)ιμ uf | 13 φυλης ltf] + υιων u | 14 την] γην | τον] + τε | 16
 -αζαρου i: + υιον αυρων | ιερεως uⁱ | αρχιερεως u^{ml}tf | 19 των]> | 23 ιτλ] prm
 υιων t

~Λ | 7 ¶ AΘ | 12 ημσει hA | το] τους υιους B | 14 την] γην BhCAΘS : την
 γην Λ | τῷ h] + τε B rell | 16 -αζαρ] + υιον αυρων B. rell: + υιον αυρων h:
 sub - S | ιερεως hCAΣ] αρχιερεως BAΘ | 17 ανδρας]>omn | 19 των Λ]>
 B rell (post αρχοντων % in Θ) | 20 αρχων] prm και Cth Λ | 21 πατριας] + αυτων
 C | 22 των AΘΛ | 23 αρχοντες] prm ανδρες CΛΣ | οικῶ] οικον h

(so at least S and A; contrast ΘΛ which follow the B texts) || 8-14 iz
 condense || 9-13 s condenses || 10/11 ℥ condenses || 12, 13 "the sons," "of
 the sons," Bru, not in ℳ^m || 14 γην or την γην was apparently written by S ||
 τε is a Greek embellishment with which the translator may be credited ||
 16 The *κουνη* addition which may go back to כִּנְיָהּ בִּן ℳ^s and which Origen
 placed sub obelo was excised by the K recension (and re-introduced in UF) ||
 S apparently wrote αρχιερεως (B, followed by AΘ, also u^{ml}tf) which Origen
 and the K recension corrected into ιερεως (so also h) || 17 ανδρας peculiar to
 the K recension || 19 των should be deleted || 20 There does not seem to be
 any good reason for the conjunction || 20/21 Omission through homoiote-
 leuton in s || 23 υιων, as so frequently, an idle addition || ανδρες (CΛΣ) goes
 back to Origen = יְהוֹשֻׁעַ ℳ^m

K 169a

πατριων εισι
χιλιαρχοι ιηλ' :

XXII

¹⁵ Και παρεγενον-

15

το προς τους υ-

5 ιους ρουβην· και

προς τους υιους

γαδ'· και προς το

ημισυ φυλης υ-

ιων μανασση·

10 εις γην γαλααδ'

και ελαλησαν

προς αυτους λε-

γοντες· ¹⁶ταδε

16

λεγει η συναγω-

15 γη κῡ πασα· τις

η πλημμελεια

αυτη· ην επλημ-

μελησεται ενᾱ-

τι θῡ ιηλ'· αποστρα-

169a 1 [πατριων]] πατρικων \mathfrak{L} | εισι s | 3 \P r | 4-12 τους — προς] > o | 5/7 ρουβην, γαδ] \sim \mathfrak{L} | 4-10 προς — γαλααδ] > s | 8/9 υιων] > \mathfrak{L} | 9 μανασση \mathfrak{L} | 10 γην] την \mathfrak{L} | 13 \P r | 14 λεγει ο | 14/15 η συναγωγη κῡ πασα Kro] πασα συναγωγη κῡ s \mathfrak{L} | 16 πλημμελεια Ks] πλημμελια ro | 18 -μελησατε ro¹

169a 3 \P u | 4-11 προς — ελαλησαν] > iz | 5/7 ρουβην, γαδ] \sim | 6 > f | ρουβιν lt] ρουβ(ε)μι uf | 14/15 η συναγωγη κῡ πασα] \sim | 14 η] > z | 18 -μελησατε | 19 θῡ] prn του | 22/23 υμιν εαντοις

169a 1 [πατριων] + αυτων \mathfrak{C} (cf. σ' \mathfrak{S}^m) | 3 \P hA Θ | 5, 7 ρουβην, γαδ A Θ] A \mathfrak{S} \sim Bh \mathfrak{C} | 7/8 το ημισυ h Θ A] τους ημισεις BA | 8/9 υιων] > omn | ημισει h* ημισυ h² | 10 γην h Θ A \mathfrak{S}] την B \mathfrak{C} A | 13 \P hA Θ | 14/15 η συναγωγη κῡ πασα] \sim omn [[η > h]] : + οι υιοι ιηλ sub \times \mathfrak{S} | 18 -μελησατε omn | 18/19 εναντι

169a 1 αυτων \mathfrak{C} may be an innocent addition by the translator as so frequently elsewhere; but σ' (according to \mathfrak{S}^m) had it, and it is found in \mathfrak{H}^m || 4-12, 4-11, 4-10 Various methods of condensation (o, s, iz) || 6 f condenses || 8/9 υιων K texts (except \mathfrak{L}) not in \mathfrak{H}^m || 10 την B \mathfrak{C} A an error for γην || 15 The addition οι υιοι ιηλ \mathfrak{S} sub ast is shared by none else and is probably an error (the phrase may have been introduced from vs. 12) || 18 -μελησεται

K 169a	20	φηναι σημερῶ απο κῦ οικοδο- μησαι αυτοις υ- μιν βωμον· και	XXII
169b		[γενεσθαι υμας] αποστατ[ας απο] κῦ· ¹⁷ μη μ[ικρον] υμιν το [αμαρτη- μα φογ[ωρ οτι] ου κεκα[θαρισμε-] θα απ αυ[του εως] της ημε[ρας ταυ-] της· κα[ι εγενη-] θη πληγ[η εν τη]	17

(-μελησται ο*)s | 19 θῦ] prm του R: prm κῦ ℒ | 21 οικοδο- K] οικοδο- ο: prm και ο | 21/22 οικοδομησαντες ℒ | 22/23 αυτοις υμιν K] υμιν αυτοις r: υμιν εαντοις s ℒ: υμιν ο | 23 και] > ℒ

169b 1/2 γενεσθαι υμας αποστατας KR] αποστατας υμας γενεσθαι ℒ | 2 απο] > ο | 3 μη] η (sed v. Robert) ℒ | 4 αμαρτι- ο | 5 οντι ο | 6/7 κεκα[θαρισμε]θα Krs] κεκαθαρισθημεθα ο | 10 πλιγγ ο* (πληγγ ο¹) | 13 [-ησεσθε] Krs] -ησεσθαι ο |

169b 1-2 γενεσθαι υμας αποστατας] αποστατας υμας γενεσθαι | 5 φογορ z | 6/7 κεκαθαρισμεθα (θα superscr) z | 15-17 και — σημερον (απο κῦ)] > z |

ΑΔ] εναντιον B rel | θῦ] prm του BhΘ: prm κῦ του A | 21 απο] + οπισθεν ΕΔ et sub ※ § | 21/22 οικοδομησαντες omn | 22/23 αυτοις υμιν] ~ Bh: εαντοις ΑΘΔ§ | 23 και Ε] > B rel

169b 1-2 γενεσθαι υμας αποστατας] αποστατας υμας γενεσθαι B rel: αποστατας γενεσθαι υμας Δ: + σημερον ΕΔ et sub ※ § | 3 κῦ] prm του B | ¶ A | 4 υμιν hΕΑΘΔ] ημιν B§ | 6/7 κεκαθαρισμεθα hΑΘ] εκαθαρισθημεν ΒΔ | 10 πληγγ] prm η Δ: πλημμελια h | 12/13 αποστραφησεσθε ΑΘ§] απεστραφητε

K, a plain error for -μελησται || 19 ℒΑ are isolated with their plus || 21 οπισθεν was added by Origen so as to express אָפּוֹשֶׁת (the asterisked word also in Ε; naturally not in ΑΘ) || 22/23 Origen omitted υμιν and retained εαντοις (so also ΑΘ) because the Hebrew had only one word || 23 και of Ε and the K texts (except ℒ) is not in the Hebrew

169b 2 σημερον was added by Origen, = הַיּוֹם (also in Ε) || 10 The article which is found in Δ goes back to Origen; comp. הַהַר || 12/13 The

K 169b

συναγω[γη κῦ]
¹⁸ και υμε[ις απο-]
 στραφ[ησεσθε]
 σημερον [απο κῦ]
 15 και εστ[αι εαν α-]
 ποστητ[ε σημε-]
 ρον και α[υριῶ]
 επι παν[τα ἡλ]
 η οργη εσ[ται:]
 20 ¹⁹ Και νυν ε[ι μικρα]
 υμιν η γ[η της]
 κατασχ[εσεως]
 υμων· δι[αβητε]

XXII

18

19

14 σημερον]>℥ | [κῦ] KR] + θῦ υμων ℥ | 15-19 και εσται αυριον επι παντα
 ἡλ η οργη ο: και αυριον επι παστα ἡλ εσται η οργη s | 15 εσται]>℥ | 17 -ρον]
 + απο κῦ r℥ | 19 εσται η οργη rs℥ | 20 ¶ rs | ελ]η ο | 21 η]>ο | 23 υμων Krs]
 >ο: κῦ ℥

16 -ποστραφητε | 17 -ρον]+ απο κῦ | 19 η οργη εσται]~ | 20 ¶ u

BhⓈ | 14 απο] οπισθεν Ⓢ | 15 ¶ Ⓢ | εαν] + υμεις Ⓢ et sub ✕ S | 16/17
 σημερον (απο) in mg et sup ras A⁷ (σημερον>A^{*vid}): απο κῦ omn | 17 και]>
 Ⓢh | 19 η οργη εσται]~B : εσται οργη hAⓈ : ἡ-εἰς ἡ-α S | 20 ¶ >
 BhAⓈ | 21 υμιν η γη hⓈAⓈ] η γη υμων B : η γη ΔS | 23 διαβητε] + υμιν S

translator apparently wrote the aorist (whether ℥^s read **סחב**, or whether the translator not understanding that the clause was interrogative took the imperfect in the sense of an aorist, it is difficult to say); both recensions (note, however, that Δ goes with B) have correctly the future tense || 14 οπισθεν of Ⓢ may be grounded after all in Ethiopic idiom; but see above on 169a, 21 || 15-19 In s the omission may be due to homoioteleuton, comp. z; but it may just as well represent condensation, comp. o || 15 υμεις=**סחב** was added by Origen (also in Ⓢ) || 17 απο κῦ omitted in K through error || και of the apodosis all except hⓈ || 20 Maes suggests that Ⓢ wrote **μικρα** which was then corrupted into **μικρα** || 21 υμιν of the K texts also in hⓈAⓈ; B has a redundant υμων (which perhaps represents an original υμιν) deleted by Origen || On the other hand, S adds υμιν after διαβητε l. 23 || 23 κῦ ℥ a clear error which led to the omission of κῦ in l. 3 of the next column

K 170a

XXII

[εις την γην της]
 [κατα]σχεσεως
 [κῦ· ο]υ εστιν η
 [σκηνη] η κῦ και
 5 [κατα]κληρονο-
 [μησε]ται εν η-
 [μιν·] και απο κῦ
 [μη α]ποσταται
 [γινε]σθαι· και
 10 [υμει]ς μη απο-
 [στητ]αι δια το
 [οικοδ]ομησαι υ-
 [μας β]ωμον εξω
 [του θ]υσιαστη-
 15 [ριου] κῦ του θυ

170a 3 κῦ KR]>℥ | εστιν] erit ℥ | 6 -μησατε rs: -μισαται ο (αι corr in ε):
 + αυτην ℥ | 6/7 υμιν r | 8 αποστατε r | 9 γινεσθε r: γενησθε s | 7-9 και μη απο
 κῦ αποσταται γενησθε ℥ | 10 υμεις Kr℥] αφ ημων s: >ο | 11 -στητε rs!

170a 3 εστιν] κατασκηνοι εκει | 6 -μησατε | 6-12 -ται — οικοδομη-]>i |
 7-9 και — γινεσθαι] και μη απο κῦ αποσταται γενηθητε | 10 υμεις] απο ημων |

170a 1 εις] επι A | 3 ου] οπον Λ | εστιν] κατασκηνοι εκει omh | 4 σκηνη]
 κιβωτος A | 6 -μησετε B] -μησατε hAΘΛΣ | 7-9 και απο κῦ μη αποσταται
 γινεσθε cf. Σ] και μη αποσταται απο θυ γενησθε B : και μη αποστατε απο θυ
 γενηθητε h: και μη απο κῦ αποσταται γενηθητε AΘ : απο κῦ μη αποσταται
 γενηθητε Λ | 10 υμεις B^{ab} ^{superscr}h^{efh}] απο ημων AΘΛΣ | 11 αποστητε

170a 3 εστιν KR(℥) against all the other texts and ℥^m || 4 The reading
 of A is singular (or sub-singular, comp. 121) || 6 K goes with B in reading
 the future || αυτην ℥ superfluous || 7-9 Kr come nearest to Σ comp. Λ in
 that the order of the Hebrew is strictly adhered to; with AΘ (comp. uf) the
 witnesses mentioned share κῦ=יְהוָה ℥^m; the essential difference between
 these two recensions (K and Origen) and the B recension consists in the
 name of the Deity (θῦ in the latter) || 10 יְהוָה was expressed by Origen
 only (it passed into AΘ, but also into suf); ℥^s probably read יְהוָה (hence
 υμεις of the other texts), which, of course, is an inferior reading; o merely
 condenses || 11 The addition in Bh^e due to the faulty reading discussed in

K 170a

[ημω]ν· ²⁰ ουχ ει-

20 XXII

[δου α]χαρ ο του

[ζαρα] πλημμε-

[λιαν] επλημμε-

20 [λησε]ν· απο του

[αναθ]εματος·

[και ε]πι πασαν

[την σ]υναγωγῇ

170b

ιῆλ εγενηθη οργη·

και ουτος εις μο-

νος ην· μη μονος

αυτος απεθανε·

5 εν τη αυτου αμαρ-

τια: ²¹ και απεκρι-

21

θησαν οι υιοι ρου-

-σταιτε s* | 12 οικωδομοσαι ο | 16 υμων s | ¶ rs | 16/17 ουκ ιδου R | ιδου]>℥ | 19 -λιαν Kro] -λεια s: *neglegens* ℥

170b 1 ιῆλ]>ο | οργη] + κῦ ο | 2 ουτος Kr ℥] ουτως r: αυτος ο | 2/3 εις μονος] *unus* ℥ | 4 αυτος Kr] ουτος s℥ : >ο | 5 τη] τι ο | εαυτους | 6 ¶ rs |

16/17 ουκ ιδου | 18-20 πλημμ. επλημμ.] ~i

170b 1 ιῆλ]>z | οργη lt] prm η uf | 2 εις ltff]>uz | ; 4 αυτος ltff]>uz | 5 εν]> | αυτου ltr]>u | 6 ¶ l | ρουβιν lti: ρουβ(ε)ιμ ufz | 8 οι]>fz | οι υιοι]>i |

AΘA§] + απο κῦ Bh ℥ | 16 ¶ A | ουχ Ah* (ουκ h¹) | 17 αχαρ B[℥]h rell] αχαν A§ | 18 ζαρα] 'azōr ℥^h | 19 -λ(ε)ιαν] λ(ε)ια omn | 20 -λησεν] ε sup ras A^{at} | 23 την AΘA

170b 1 εγενηθη] ενηθη sup ras B^{17at} | 2/3 μονος sub - § | 3 ην AΘ] sub emnisco § : >BA | μη μονος]>B | 3/4 μονος αυτος cf B] μονος ουτος AΘ: ουτος μονος A et sub - § | 5 εν] >AA | αυτου ΘA] εαυτου AB | 2/6 και -

the last note || 17 αχαν = ܐܚܢ ℥^m only A§ || 19 The MSS waver between the dat. and accus. to express the inner accus. in Hebrew

170b 2-6 It is clear that the text of B is faulty; the words ην μη μονος dropped out through homoioteleuton; thus barring minor points all three recensions agreed. Perhaps ܐܢܝ ܐܡ goes back to ܐܢܝ ܐܡ by the side of which ܐܢܝ ܐܡ ℥^s was a justifiable variant || 10 ιων not in ℥^m || 11/12 i condenses || 13 λεγοντες all, not in ℥^m, hence sub obelo Origen || 14-16 Origen's text which is identical with that of AΘ (comp. also s) was, as the obelus shows, substantially the same as the current text; the differences between it and B are slight (B transposes κς εστιν and omits the last κς; with the B text goes also ℥, minor differences notwithstanding); the introduction of

K 170b

βην και οι υιοι γαδ'

XXII

και το ημισυ φυ-

10 λης υιων μανασ-

ση· και ελαλησᾱ

τοις χιλιарχοις·

ῑηλ' λεγοντες·

²²ο θς̄ αυτος εστιν

22

15 κς̄ ο θς̄· και ο θς̄ αυ-

τος οιδεν· και ῑηλ'

αυτος διαγνωσε-

ται· ει εν αποστα-

σεια πεπλημμε-

20 ληκαμεν εναν-

τι κ̄υ· μη ρυσηται

ημας εν ταυτη·

²³Και ει οικοδομησα-

23

8 οι]>ο | gat 1 | 10 υιων Ks]>ro 1 | μανασση 1 | 13 λεγοντες ο | 14-16 ο θς̄
 θς̄ κς̄ εστιν· και ο θς̄· θς̄ κς̄ οιδεν αυτος s: ο θς̄ θς̄ εστιν και ο κς̄ και ο θς̄ αυτος
 οιδεν 1 | 14 εστι ro | 15 ο θς̄ 2°]>ο | 16 οιδε ro | 16-18 και—διαγνωσεται]>1 |
 19 -σια R | 21 ρυσηται K] ρυσεται ο: ρυσετο s: liberet 1 | 22 ταυτη K 1] prm
 τη ημερα R | 20 ¶ rs | 23 ωκοδομησα- R

9 φυλης] prm της i | 11/12 ελαλησαν τοις χιλιарχοις] ειπον αυτοις i | 12
 χιλιарχαις u | 20/21 εναντι] εναντιον z: απεναντι rell | 21 κ̄υ] prm του t | 21
 ρυσεται | 22 ταυτη] prm τη ημερα

αυτου]>h | 6 ¶ hAΘ | 9 ημισει hA | 10 υιων]>omn | 13 λεγοντες sub + s | 14-
 16 ο θς̄ ο θς̄ κς̄ εστιν και ο θς̄ ο θς̄ κς̄ αυτος οιδεν [ο 2°]>A | εστιν και] sub + s |
 ο 4°]>A | AΘΛs: αυτος ο θς̄ θς̄ θς̄ αυτος εστιν· και ο κς̄ κς̄ αυτος οιδεν h: ο
 κς̄ αυτος εστι θς̄ και κς̄ και θς̄ θεων αυτος ο κς̄ οιδεν C: ο θς̄ θς̄ εστιν κς̄ και ο θς̄
 θς̄ αυτος οιδεν B | 17 διαγνωσεται] γνωσεται omn | 18/19 αποστασει AΘ | 19/20
 πεπλημμεληκαμεν Θ] επλημμελησαμεν BhAA | 21 κ̄υ] prm του Bh | ρυσηται Λ]
 ρυσαιτο BAΘ: ρυσαιτω h (c corr) | 22 ταυτη Bh] prm τη ημερα AΘΛs | 23 ¶ >

αυτος in the first clause distinguishes the text of Krouf from the others. All the texts err exegetically in that they look in the first clause for a confession of faith. Properly rendered, the Greek should run as follows: ο θς̄ ο θς̄ κς̄ ο θς̄ ο θς̄ κς̄ αυτος οιδεν. Certainly 𐤅𐤍 and 𐤅𐤍 were identical || 16-18 The omission in 1 probably occurred in a Latin MS || 21 𐤅𐤍 read יְהוָה־יִשְׂרָאֵל which is certainly the better reading || 22 K goes with Bh 1; ταυτη sc. τη ημερα; it goes without saying that Origen supplied the words (hence also in AΘ and UF), but they are also found in R





THE DROPSIE COLLEGE
FOR HEBREW AND COGNATE
LEARNING, PHILADELPHIA,
PA., U. S. A.

Margolis

The Rev. M. Gaster

Mispah

193 Maida Vale

London W.









A 000 057 307 1

